Vol. V., No. 10. THE JANUARY, 1916.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of TRUTH, FREEDOM, and PROGRESS in the Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus.*

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke.*

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A.

Library of the PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY Berkeley, California

CONTENTS.

THOUGHTS FROM THE WAR FOR THE CHURCH.
By Ven. BERESFORD POTTER, M.A.

THE CLERGY AND THE CREEDS.—By Rev. Professor WADE, D.D.

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.
By Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERICAL MIND.
By Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A.

REVIEWS.—The Faith and the War.—By Rev. R. B. TOLLINTON, D.D.
A Practical Religious Manual.
Study Circle Guides.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

CORRESPONDENCE.
Financial Reform in Theological Colleges.
Quakers and the New Testament.
Mr. Athelstan Riley and the Foundation of Anglicanism.
Clergymen as Combatants.

A PRAYER FOR TRUTH AND UNITY.

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.

London Agents:—WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, W.C.
ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price **6d.** net. Annual Subscription, **5/-** (including postage).

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

The Right Hon. LORD GREY, G.C.M.G., G.C.B., 22, South St., Park Lane W.
Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
PHILIP H. BAGENAL, Esq., Harrogate.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, Rest, Hodford Road, Golders Green, N.W.
The Rev. Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
The Rev. W. MANNING, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, Acrise, Hall Place Gardens, St. Albans.
The Rev. Canon H. RASHDALL, Litt.D., F.B.A., New College, Oxford.
Sir E. RUSSELL, 5, Croxteth Road, Liverpool.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq., 1, Wellington Street, Strand, London, W.C.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Rev. Dr. DUKENFIELD ASTLEY.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
Rev. Canon BANNISTER.
Rev. A. N. BAX.
Rev. J. H. C. B. de CANDOLE.
Prof. M. A. CANNEY.
Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
Rev. Canon CREMER.
Prof. CRUICKSHANK.
Rev. H. DALE.
Rev. Canon W. DANKS.
Rev. J. A. DODD.
Rev. W. A. EDWARDS.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.
Rev. Canon FOAKES-JACKSON.
Rev. JOHN GAMBLE.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. H. HANDLEY.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES.
Rev. H. LAURENCE.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.
Rev. R. G. MILBURN.
Rev. J. LLOYD MILNE.
Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
Rev. CAVENDISH MOXON.
Very Rev. ARNOLD PAGE.
Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
Rev. Canon RASHDALL.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE.
Rev. T. F. ROYDS.
Rev. C. J. SHARP.
Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
Rev. A. H. STANWAY.
Sir RICHARD STAPLEY.
Rev. J. E. SYMES.
Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
Rev. Dr. R B. TOLLINTON.
Prof. A. G. WIDGERY.
Rev. J. R. WILKINSON.
Rev. FERGUS WOOD.
Miss YOUNGHUSBAND.

Hon. Treasurer:—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.
Hon. Auditor.—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.
Hon. Secretary.—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire.
Hon. Assistant Secretaries.—Miss. D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES, Llanfoist, Clifton Downs, Bristol.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices in the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ.
5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

Annual Subscription:—Members at least 5/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. C. Moxon,** Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

***The Modern Churchman*, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent *free* to all full members of the Union, and to non-members at a charge of 5/- per annum.**

Editor:—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, to whom all literary contributions are to be sent.

Business Manager:—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION LENDING LIBRARY.

Committee:

Professor GARDNER.

Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.

Miss Alice GARDNER.

Miss W. A. COULTON.

Hon. Librarian:

Miss W. A. COULTON,

Pentney,

Swaffham,

Norfolk.

RULES.

1.—The librarian shall hold a list of books which owners are willing to lend. Th list shall contain as far as possible standard works of theology and biblica criticism; recent theological and biblical works; and books on religion an education helpful to parents and teachers.

2.—Application for a book shall be made to the librarian, who, if the book is o the list, will forward the application to the owner. The librarian would b willing, if desired, to find out books on some particular subject.

3.—The librarian shall ask the lender to send his book, postage paid, to th borrower. The borrower shall send the book back to the owner direc paying the cost of postage, and inclosing stamps to cover the outward co of postage.

4.—No volume may be kept for more than one month by a borrower. If th lender can spare his book only for a shorter period, he must let th librarian know for how long he can spare the book. In all cases th librarian shall send a postcard to the borrower at the time when the boo must be returned. If a book is needed for more than one month, th borrower must renew his application to the librarian.

5.—Not more than three volumes may be borrowed by a member at one time.

6.—The owner of any book lent must see that his or her name is written plainly i the book, not on a loose slip of paper. The librarian shall send a card t a borrower, showing the names and addresses of the the owners of th books applied for.

7.—The borrower shall be responsible for the care of the book from the time it in his possession until it is again in the possession of the owner. Anyon making marginal or other notes, or in any way marking the books lent t him, shall be deprived of the privileges of the library.

8.—The owner of a book shall have the right to reclaim it at any time, through th librarian.

9.—Every borrower must be a member or associate of the Churchmen's Union, a regular subscriber to the *Modern Churchman*.

LIST OF BOOKS.

[The letters, etc., placed after a book, indicate that other works by the same author are available.]

ABBOTT, E. A.—Silanus the Christian, etc.
ABERCROMBIE. — Culture and Discipline of the mind.
ADAM, JAMES.—The Religious Teachers of Greece, etc.
ADDIS, W. E.—Hebrew Religion, etc.
ADLER.—Ethics and Religion.
ALLEN, A. V. G.—The Continuity of Christian Thought, etc.
ALLIN. — Augustinian Revolution in Theology.
AMIEL.—Fragments d'un Journal intime.
ARNOLD, M.—Literature and Dogma, etc.
AUGUSTINE.—Confessions.
BACON, B. W.—The Fourth Gospel.
BACON.—Founding of the Church, etc.
BADHAM.—Formation of the Gospels.
BALDENSPERGER. — Selbstbewusstsein Jesu.
BALFOUR, A.—Religion of Humanity, etc.
BARRETT, W. R.—A New World of Thought.
BARTLET, J. V.—New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.
BARTLETT, R. E.—The Letter and the Spirit.
BATE, H. N.—The Healthful Spirit.
BAUR, W.—Religious Life in Germany.
BEEBY.—Creed and Life, etc.
BENNETT.—Visions of the Unseen.
BERTRAND.—Le Protestantisme Liberal.
BEVAN, E.—Jerusalem under the High Priests.
BLAKEWAY.—Claims of Modern Thought upon the Clergy.
BLUNT.—Studies in Apostolic Christianity.

BODEN, VON.—Books of the New Testament.
BOOTH, Mrs.—Aggressive Christianity, etc.
BOS, C.—Psychologie de la Croyance.
BOSE, DU.—Ecumenical Councils, etc.
BOUSSET.—What is Religion? etc.
BOUTROUX.—Science et Religion.
BOYD-CARPENTER.—Introduction to the Scriptures.
BRÉMOND.—Mystery of Newman, etc.
BROEKE, J. T. — Constructive Basis for Theology.
BROWN, W. A.—Essence of Christianity, etc.
BROWNE, D. G.—Christ and His Age.
BRUNETIÈRE.—Sur les chemins de la Croyance.
BURKITT, F. C.—Two Lectures on the Gospels, etc.
CAILLAUD.—Problème de la Résurrection du Christ.
CAIRD, E.—Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers.
CAIRD, J.—Fundamental Ideas of Christianity.
CAMBRIDGE BIBLICAL ESSAYS.—By Swete and others.
CAMBRIDGE THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS.
CAMPBELL, R. J.—New Theology.
CARPENTER, E. — First Three Gospels, etc.
CARPENTER & WICKSTEED.—Studies in Theology.
CARUS.—God: An Enquiry.
CHAMBERS.—Our Life after Death, etc.
CHARLES, R. H.—Book of Enoch, etc.

CHASE.—Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism.
CHEYNE, T. K.—Bible Problems, etc.
CLARK.—Ante-Nicene Christian Library. —Works of St. Augustine.
CLARKE.—Susanna Wesley.
CLEMEN.—Paulus, etc.
COBB, W. F.—Mysticism and the Creed.
COE.—Spiritual Life.
COHU.—Old Testament and Modern Research, etc.
COMPTON-LEITH.—Apologia Diffidentis.
CONDER.—Judas Maccabeus, etc.
CONE, O.—Paul, the Man, etc.
CONYBEARE.—The Historic Christ.
CONYBEARE & HOWSON.—St. Paul, 1-2,
CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.—Most volumes.
CRUTTWELL, C. T.—Literary History of Early Christianity.
CUNNINGHAM, W.—The Gospel of Work.
CUTTEN, G. B.—The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity.
DALE, R. W.—Essays and Addresses, etc.
DANIEL.—The Prayer Book: History, etc.
DAVIES, E. A.—Miracles of Jesus, etc.
DAVIES, L.—Morality according to the Lord's Supper.
DAWSON.—Matthew Arnold.
DAY.—Social Life of the Hebrews.
DEBITZ.—Jewish Artisan Life in the Time of Christ.
DEISSMANN.—Paulus, etc.
DENNY.—Jesus and the Gospel.
DIETERICH.—Nekyia.
DOBSCHÜTZ.—The Apostolic Age, etc.
DRIVER.—Book of Genesis, etc.
DRUMMOND, H.—Natural Law in the Spiritual World.
DRUMMOND, J.—Thessalonians, etc.
DUCHESNE.—Early History of the Church.
DUHM, B.—The Twelve Prophets.
EDGHILL.—Revelation of the Son of Go
EDMUNDSON.—The Church in Rome i the 1st century.
EHRHARD.—Der Catholicismus, etc.
EMMET.—Eschatological Questions in th Gospels, etc.
ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.
EUCKEN.—The Life of the Spirit, etc.
EVERETT.—Gospel of Paul.
FAIRBAIRN. — Catholicism, Roman an Anglican, etc.
FARNELL.—Evolution of Religion.
FAYE, E. DE.—Clement d'Alexandrie.
FIGGIS.—Church in the Modern State.
FOGAZZARO.—The Saint.
FROMMEL, G. — Etudes Littéraires Morale
FOX, N.—Christ in the Daily Meal.
FRANCIS, S.: Mirror of Perfection.
FRANKLAND, W. B.—Early Eucharist.
FREMANTLE.—The World as the Subje of Redemption, etc.
GAMBLE, J.—Christ and Criticism.
GARDNER, A.—Conflict of Duties, etc.
GARDNER, P. — Modernity and th Churches, etc.
GARVIE.—The Ritschlian Theology.
GLAZEBROOK.—The End of the Law, et
GLOVER. — Nature and Purpose of Christian Society.
GOAD.—The Kingdom.
GORE, C.—The Sermon on the Mou etc.
GOUDGE.—I. Corinthians.
GOULBURN. — Thoughts on Person Religion.
GREEN, T. H.—Lay Sermons.
GREG, W. R.—Creed of Christendom, 1-
GREY, ASA.—Natural Science and Religio
GUIGNEBERT.—Tertullian.
GWATKIN.—Knowledge of God, 1-2.
HAGENBACH.—History of the Reformatio
HALL, E. H.—Paul the Apostle.

ANDLEY.—Anglican Liberalism (Essays by Liberals).
ARNACK.—History of Dogma, etc.
ARNACK & HERMANN,—Social Gospel.
ARRIS, J. R.—Memoranda Sacra, etc.
ATCH.—Influences of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Church, etc.
AUSRATH.—New Testament Times, 1-6.
EADLAM, A. C.—Miracles of the New Testament, etc.
ERRMANN.—Communion with God.
EWSON.—The Road to Unity.
ESLOP.—Across the Border Line.
ICKS, E.—Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the New Testament.
ILL.—The Interregnum.
ITCHCOCK, F. R. M.—The Atonement and Modern Thought.
ODGINS.—Leaves from a Liberal Pulpit.
ODGKIN.—The Trial of our Faith.
OFFMANN.—Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus.
OLMES.—Creed of Christ.
OLTZMANN, H.—Handcommentar: Synoptiker und Apostelgeschiente.
OLTZMANN, O.—N. T. Zeitgechichte.
OUTIN.—Crisis among French Clergy.
OOLE, C. H.—Apostolic Fathers.
ORT.—The Christian Ecclesia, etc.
ORTON, R. F.—Inspiration and the Bible.
ÜGEL, F. VON.—Eternal Life.
UGHES, H. P.—Social Christianity.
UTTON, A. W.—Ecclesia Discens, etc.
UTTON, R. H.—Essays, Theological and Literary.
UTTON, W. H.—The Church and the Barbarians.
LINGWORTH.—Reason and Revelation, etc.
NGE.—Christian Mysticism, etc.
ACKSON, J.—The Preacher and the Modern Mind, etc.

JACKSON, H. LATIMMR.—The Fourth Gospel, etc.
JAMES, W.—Pragmatism, etc.
JEVONS, F. B.—Personality, etc.
JOHNS, C. H. W.—Laws of Babylon and the Hebrews.
JONES.—The New Testament in the 20th century.
JOWETT.—Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, etc.
JÜLICHER.—Introduction to the New Testament.
KALTENBUSCH.—Von Schleiermacher zu Ritschl.
KELLY.—The Church and Religious Unity.
KENNETT, R. H.—In our Tongues, etc.
KING.—Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews.
KRÜGER.—Altchristliche Literatur.
LAKE.—The Resurrection of Jesus Christ, etc.
LA TOUCHE.—Person of Christ in Modern Thought.
LATHAM.—Pastor Pastorum, etc.
LE BRETON.—La Résurrection du Christ.
LECKY, J. H.—Authority in Religion.
LE ROY.—Dogme et Critique.
LIDDON.—Our Lord's Divinity.
LIGHTFOOT.—Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, etc.
LILLEY, A. J.—Modernism—A Record and Review, etc.
LOBSTEIN.—Virgin Birth of Christ.
LODGE, O.—Man and the Universe, etc.
LOISY.—Les Evangiles Synoptiques, etc.
LOOFS.—What is the truth about Jesus Christ?
LOTZE.—Philosophy of Religion.
LYTTELTON.—Place of Miracles in Religion.
MACALISTER, R. A. S.—The Philistines.
MACAN.—Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

MACKINTOSH. — The Person of Jesus Christ, etc.

MACRAN.—English Apologetic Theology.

MAJOR, H. D. A.—The Gospel of Freedom.

MARTIN. — Books of the New Testament.

MARTINEAU, J.—Endeavours after the Christian Life, etc.

MAXWELL.—Metapsychical Phenomena.

MAYOR, J. B.—Readings from the Psalms.

MEIER, E.—Papyrusfund von Elephantine.

MEYER.—Jesus or Paul.

MEYER, A.—Gesch. des Urchristenthums.

MILLIET.—La Dynamis et les trois ames.

MILLIGAN.—New Testament Documents.

MOFFATT.—Theology and the Gospels, etc.

MOMERIE.—Belief in God, etc.

MONTEFIORE, C. G. — The Synoptic Gospels, etc.

MOORE, A.—Science and the Faith.

MOREY.—Eastern Christian Paintings.

MOULTON.—Early Religious Poetry of Persia.

MOXON, P. S.—From Jerusalem to Nicaea.

MOZLEY.—Ritschlianism.

MÜLLER, K.—Kirchengeschichte.

MURPHY, J. J.—Scientific Basis of Faith.

MYERS, F. W. H.—Human Personality.

NEUMANN.—Jesus.

NEWMAN, F. W.—The Soul.

NEWMAN, J. H.—Apologia.

NIPPOLD.—Die Theologische Einzelschule.

NOLLOTH.—Person of our Lord.

OESTERLEY.—Jewish Doctrines of Mediation, etc.

ORCHARD.—Modern Theories of Sin.

ORR.—Ritschlian Theology.

OTTO.—Naturalism and Religion.

OVERTON, J. H.—J. Wesley.

PAGE.—Conformity and Conscience.

PATTEN SMYTH.—The Gospel of t Hereafter.

PEABODY.—Jesus Christ and the Soc Question.

PEAKE. — Critical Introduction to t New Testament.

PETRE.—Life and Letters of Tyrrell.

PETRIE.—Growth of the Gospels.

PFENNIGSDORF.—Lepsius u. Ritschl.

PFLEIDERER.—Early Christian Concepti of Christ, etc.

PICTON, J. A.—Pantheism, etc.

PLUMMER.—St. Luke.

POOLE.—Wyclif.

PROTHERO, R. E.—Psalms in Human Li

RACKHAM.—The Acts.

RAMSAY, W. M.—The Church in t Roman Empire, etc.

RASHDALL.—Doctrine and Developme etc.

REITZENSTEIN.—Hellenistische Mysteri Religionen.

RENAN. — Historie du Peuple d'Isra etc.

RÉVILLE, A.—Jésus de Nazareth.

RÉVILLE, J.—Le Quatrième Evangile.

RITSCHL, A.—Unterricht in der Chri lichen Religion.

ROBERTSON, F. W.—Sermons.

ROBINSON, A.—Study of the Gospels.

ROBINSON, C. H.—Studies in the Ch acter of Christ.

ROBINSON, J. A.—Unity in Christ.

ROMESTIN, H. D. DE.—Teaching of t Twelve Apostles.

ROTHERHAM.—Studies in the Psalms.

ROUBY.—Vérité sur Lourdes.

ROYCE, J.—Spirit of Modern Philosop

RUSSELL.—Christian Theology and Soc Progress.

RUTHERFORD, W. G.—Romans.

RYLE.—Early Naratives of Genesis.

ATIER, A.—La Philosophie de la Religion.

ATIER, P.—Les Modernistes, etc.

NTYVES.—Reliques et Images legendaires, etc.

MON.—Infallibility of the Church.

DAY.—Life of Christ in Recent Research, etc.

NDAY & HEADLAM.—Romans.

ROLEA.—Cardinal Newman.

VAGE.—Life beyond Death.

HLEIERMACHER. — Der Christliche Glaube, etc.

HUBERT.—Kirchengeschichte, etc.

HÜRER.—Jewish People in the Time of Christ.

HWEITZER.—Paul and his Interpreters, etc.

OTT, E. F.—The Fourth Gospel.

OTT.—Apologetic of the New Testament.

ELEY, J. R.—Natural Religion, etc.

LBIE.—Evangelical Christianity, etc.

EBECK.—Religion und Philosophie.

MPSON, J. G.—Creative Revelation.

CLERGY.—Lay Views.

OXFORD TUTORS.—Contentio Veritatis.

ITH, G. A.—The Twelve Prophets, etc.

HM.—Outlines of Church History.

LTAU.—Birth of Jesus Christ.

ENCER, F. A. M.—Meaning of Christianity.

ANLEY.—Christian Institutions, etc.

ARBUCK, G. D.—Psychology of Religion.

EAD.—After Death.

EPHEN, C.—The Vision of Faith, etc.

EVENS, G. B.—Theology of the New Testament.

REETER.—Restatement and Reunion, etc.

RONG.—Historical Christianity.

TETE.—St. Mark.

SYMES, J. E.—Broad Church.

TALBOT, E. G.—Leeds Sermons.

TALBOT, G. F.—Jesus, His Opinions and Character.

TEMPLE.—Repton School Sermons, etc.

TENNANT.—The Concept of Sin.

THEOLOGISCHE LITERATURZEITUNG. — 1897-1900.

THOMAS.—A Free Catholic Church.

TISCHENDORF.—Septuagint, etc.

TOUTAIN, J.—Études de Mythologie et d'Histoire.

TORREY, R. A.—How to obtain fullness of Power.

TRENCH.—St. Augustine: Sermon on the Mount.

TREVELYAN, G. M.—England in the Age of Wyclif.

TROELTSCH.—Protestantism and Progress.

TURNER.—Studies in Early Church History.

TYRRELL, G.—Christianity at the Cross Roads, etc.

UNDERHILL, E.—Practical Mysticism.

VINCENT.—History of Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

VOYSEY.—Mystery of Pain, Death and Sin.

WAGGETT.—Religion and Science.

WALKER.—Teaching of Christ.

WALLACE, W.—Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology.

WALLAS.—Across the Barrier.

WARSCHAUER.—What is the Bible? etc.

WEINEL & WIDGERY.—Jesus in the 19th century.

WEINER.—Confessions of Christendom.

WEINGARTEN.—Zeittafeln der Kirchengeschiche.

WEISS, B.—Einleitung in das N. T.

WEISS, J.—Paul and Jesus, etc.

WEIZSÄCKER.—Apostolic Age, etc.

WELLHAUSEN.—Christliche Religion, etc.

WELLS.—First and Last Things.
WENDLAND.—Miracles and Christianity, etc.
WENDT.—Apostelgeschichte, etc.
WERNER.—Dogmengeschichtliche Tabellen.
WERNLE.—Beginnings of Christianity, etc.
WERNZ.—Jesus and the Gospel.
WESTCOTT.—Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, etc.
WILLIAMS, W. J.—Newman, Pascal and Loisy.
WIMMER.—Struggle for Light.
WHISTON.—Translation of Josephus.
WREDE.—Paul.
WRIGHT, A.—New Testament Problem
WOODS.—At the Temple Church.
ZANGWILL.—The Next Religion.
Facing the Facts.
Il Programma dei Modernisti.
Pro Christo et Ecclesia.
The New Trend in Religion.
A Scripture Bibliography. Drawn up
Headmistresses of Girls' Schools.

It must be observed that this list is not complete; if any member of the Union wishes to borrow a theological work not mentioned in it, it would be well to write to the Librarian, who will also welcome any further lists of books available for lending.

PAGE.

Thoughts from the War for the Church 497
The Clergy and the Creeds 504
The Outfit of a Modern Churchman 516
The Training of the Clerical Mind 520
Reviews—The Faith and the War 528
A Practical Religious Manual 538
Study Circle Guides 538
Churchmen's Union News 539
Correspondence—Financial Reform in Theological Colleges ... 540
Quakers and the New Testament 540
Mr. Athelstan Riley and the Foundation of Anglicanism 540
Clergymen as Combatants 543
A Prayer for Truth and Unity 544

CLERICAL WORK required in a Southern town. Bachelor. Stipend immaterial. Age 49. M.A., Cambridge. 13, St. Peter's Road, St. Leonard's-on-Sea.

The Modern Churchman.

No. 10. JANUARY, 1916. Vol. V.

THOUGHTS FROM THE WAR FOR THE CHURCH.

By the Ven. Beresford Potter, M.A., Archdeacon in Cyprus and Syria.

It is important that the Church should direct her thoughts, during the continuance of this great and terrible war, to the lessons which the war has to teach her, and through her the nation. Great as are the sufferings which are now being endured, we who believe in the Christian God must hold that all things are overruled for good to those who believe and obey, that there is a light behind the cloud, which will eventually become visible to those whose vision has been quickened by obedience and faith. War is a great evil, but evil is overruled for good. How sad to suffer the evil, and miss the good.

The first lesson is to avoid the evils which caused the war. One which stands out prominently is the separation of morals from public life. German philosophic teachers have laid it down that Christian morality must not enter into the life of a nation as a nation. Nietzsche scorned Christian morality as incapable of producing the superman. Professor Schlettwein, a Government expert on colonization, wrote in 1914:—

> "In dealing with the Hereros, feelings of philanthropy and Christianity must be repudiated with all energy."

Bernhardi wrote:—

> "The persistent struggle for possessions and power governs the relations of one nation with another. Right is respected only so for as it is compatible with advantage—Might is the supreme right."

Treitschke, Professor at Freiburg, Heidelberg, and Berlin (1863 to 1896) wrote:—

> "Thus we must distinguish between private and public morality. A whole series of duties which are obligatory for the individual are not to be thought of by the State. To maintain itself is for it always the highest commandment. That is absolutely moral for it."

The Kaiser said at Bremerhaven, 27th July, 1900, to the German contingent going to China:—

> "Quarter is not to be given. Prisoners are not to be made. As King Attila made himself a name a thousand years ago, so may your name be known."

Such doctrines paved the way for war—cruel, immoral war, based on bare self-interest, and supported by deliberate lying and barbaric injustice. If the German Christian Churches had imbued the German nation with Christian morals, there could not have been such a war.

When we sent Lord Haldane to Berlin to try and come to an agreement about reducing armaments, if Christian feeling had prevailed in National Councils, war could not have come—some way would have been found out of the tangle, some mutual concessions would have been arranged which would have satisfied both parties, and have caused immediate reduction of armaments. But materialism prevailed—Christianity was banished. War resulted.

Hence the prime lesson from the war is to see that in future, political life should be imbued with moral ideals. Political life means (as the Greek word indicates) the life of the people as a community. If Christian morals are needful for individuals they must be needful for nations.

And herein lies a grave lesson for the Church. Not to abstain from politics, but rather to enter into them—regarding politics not in their material but in their moral aspect. Moreover it is most important to keep clear in one's mind what is the purely moral aspect of a question, and not to confuse this, as is often done, with lesser issues, which do not practically touch morals at all.

May I give an instance of what I mean? When the Congo question was before the country, this seemed to me a purely moral question. Whether England should or should not stand by and do nothing, while a people whom she, with others, had pledged herself to protect, were subjected to most cruel and abominable hardships. To fail in doing this, was to divorce morals from public life, the German sin which caused the war.

To encourage or permit any unrighteous political condition, for instance, to hinder the trade of a sister country, so that our own trade may prosper; to allow the public sale of honours; to permit bribery, direct or indirect, in the election of a country's representatives; these are instances of that non-moral, not to say immoral, political action which causes those evil conditions out of which international or civil war arises.

And what great opportunities there are for the Church in such questions to uplift the nation's morals, if she combines her forces for that great effort. Nothing would make her more truly the servant of mankind, and at the same time the servant of Christ, than if she were with unsparing hand to hold herself back from any question which concerned only her own material interests; and were to leave such questions to be fought out on her behalf by the people at large, and to confine herself entirely to real battle and real effort where purely moral and spiritual questions are concerned. Here, too, would be a basis for unity; for all the various Christian organizations might here unite on common ground, namely, to act in public life on the really important elementary moral principles which underlie our common Christianity. But the further question arises, if the principle of non-morality pervades the politics of a nation in any degree, must it not also pervade the individuals who make up the nation? Certainly in self-governing countries it would be impossible for a non-moral political system to exist for any length of time if the electorate of the country were imbued with belief in and the resolution to act on Christian moral principles. So, in Germany and England, if there be non-morality in political life there must be non-moral principles working among the people of the country; and for the existence of that, the Christian Church cannot escape responsibility.

Therefore the war demands from the Church an account of her stewardship. It asks whether the Church has been devoting, as she ought, her whole strength to the uplifting towards a Christ-like level of the morals of her people; or

whether she has been spending her energy in tithing mint and anise and cummin. The war speaks to us Churchmen once more with the voice of the prophet:—

> "Bring no more vain oblations—your incense is an abomination unto Me—wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes. What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The moral for the Church is clear. Subordinate means to ends—lesser things to greater things. Forget not that creeds and ordinances are a means towards the higher life, but valueless except in so far as that end is attained. A true balance; a careful discrimination; a weighing of important things with less important, and seeing to it that the thing of value is what we are really seeking. This seems a war lesson for the Church.

But it may be said, in the case of the present war, Germany was the aggressor. It was her non-moral doctrines which caused the war. Had we been absolutely moral in our private and political life, the shock of arms would have come all the same. That, certainly, on the whole seems true; yet I believe it also to be true that the more moral the policy of the attacked nation, the stronger she will be to resist. Our strength now lies in our morality—our weakness in where this has been not so clear. We were just to the Boers after the war—and Botha has nobly repaid us. Ireland has come fairly well through the trial, but we have been for a long time atoning to her for past misgovernment. India is loyal. We have been just to her; and wherever she has been disloyal it has been due to unjust and unwise treatment. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, have rallied nobly to the flag—because we gave them liberty and protection. Persia is a weak spot. Irish Americans have been a thorn in our side. At home, party politics have not been above reproach; and labour troubles and intemperance have not helped us.

So the Germans as a nation may be strong, though non-moral, but already there are evidences that their non-morality will be the cause of their downfall. Belgian atrocities, murders of non-combatants, plotting in neutral countries, unvarnished

lying, are, if slowly, yet surely, rousing the neutral world against the idea of accepting the dominance of this non-moral state.

Another lesson from the war is the duty of bringing home to the Christian world the meaning of the cross of Christ. This has been a central thought in Christianity. The symbol of the cross has been used all through the centuries as the chief flag of the Christian faith. And those who for theological reasons have objected to cross or crucifix, have nevertheless dwelt on the importance of the death on the cross. But the real question is: What does the cross symbolize and mean for the life of man? Not surely only that something took place on Calvary which releases men from the need of sacrifice; but rather something which pointed the way to sacrifice—sacrifice of the individual for the good of the whole: sacrifice of the lower for the attainment of the higher: sacrifice of desires which tend to soil or spoil the soul, to attain others which uplift and purify it. Well, we have symbolized sacrifice; we have preached it for nineteen hundred years; now comes the question as to the practice of it.

The war has called loudly for sacrifice. In a country unused to military discipline the demand has gone forth to submit to it in a righteous cause. Thank God, our voluntary system has given this great opportunity to the Nation to carry into practice the main principle of its Faith. The Nation has responded. An army of a few hundred thousand has in a year grown into millions. Men have flocked in, led, most of them, by the noblest motives. I have seen it, and have been told it by the officers in command. I do not believe that these men would have come in so readily were they doubtful about the justice of their cause. But enough was known to convince even the doubting who was the aggressor, who was the real sinner in this great crime against civilization and humanity. It is no light thing for a man to give up family ties, comforts, and prospects at home in exchange for hardships, permanent disablement, or death. But it has been done, and the fact

shows that the heart of England is really sound, and that Kipling's words are true:—

> "If England were what England seems
> And not the England of our dreams
> But only putty, brass, and paint,
> How soon we'd chuck her—but she ain't."

But to come to the duty of the Church in this matter. Are we to be behindhand in the duty of self-sacrifice? That is a pressing question. We clergy have felt it our duty to urge young men to go forward. We knew that the war was either right or wrong. If it were right we felt we must urge the duty of obeying the call. But officers must lead the way, and we are the officers in the army of the living God, which calls for self-sacrifice from its rank and file. It cannot be a question of "Go on," but of "Come on." I do not propose to enter into the particular question of whether under any circumstances clergy should or should not be combatants; but I do want to urge the above principle, and to ask that the clergy shall be satisfied in their consciences that they are in actual fact making a real sacrifice equal to, not less than, that demanded by them from their flock.

And what a lesson of self-sacrifice the war is giving to us in other ways—of self-sacrifice leading to real inward reward! People of all ranks and classes working and fighting side by side, their brotherhood cemented by the sacredness of their cause! How pleasant to see the inbred political party spirit which seemed likely to destroy our institutions gradually being dissipated!

Another lesson from the war is its influence on views of death. One of the great arguments of the opponents of Christianity is the non-correspondence of men's actual lives with what they profess to believe. Nietzsche scornfully points out the difference between the Englishman's conception of a gentleman with Christ's conception of the highest type of man.

With regard to Eternity; we believe that man survives the grave, that he exists in some form of personal life through all the ages of future time. An appalling thought truly—one

which ought to have vast influence on life on earth. Yet in practice how many Christians ignore this apparently strongly held belief. How men will quarrel over the material things; matters which concern success in this world, rank, power, wealth, consideration; and plan and think and work for these; and try to save their lives, so that they may realise these rewards. But the war is the voice of God bidding us to remember our immortality, causing the soul to uplift itself above this earthly plane; and mount with wings into the atmosphere of the Eternal. How much stronger, and nobler, and braver, and believing that man feels who having made the great sacrifice, and having resolved to run the risk of early death has thus severed himself from the clogging influences of materialism, and learned to find his true value in his spiritual self. Rank, wealth, possessions, comforts, titles, all these things seem small and poor to him who stands up sincere, brave, and trustful, to face life or death, caring not very much which it is, so long as he is enabled to play the game, and do the right thing to the end.

What a lesson the soldiers can teach us when they come back from the war! What sermons their experiences will preach! How they will put to shame the mere professional advocate of things of which he has no experience!

Lastly, the war should be an incentive to missionary energy of a really Christ-like kind. Such barbarities as the decimation of the Armenian people, the cruelties against Belgians, Poles, and Serbs should become impossible in the future. Missions must grow at home and abroad, in so-called Christian, as well as in heathen countries. Their object must not be to kill existing religions, which, if imperfect, are better than none; not merely to make converts to communities, some of which show not enough Christian spirit in their own conduct; but to spread in all the world the real good news: that God loves the world; that the world must love God; and show its love to God by following in the footsteps of Him who was perfect man, and revealed in Himself the Life of God.

THE CLERGY AND THE CREEDS.[1]

By the Rev. Professor WADE, D.D., Lampeter.

The duty which the clergy discharge in the conduct of public worship inevitably exposes them, in respect of the recitation of the creeds, to criticism which a lay worshipper can, at his option, evade. The officiating minister has, by virtue of his office, to lead a profession of faith in which the layman is under no legal constraint to join. If, therefore, it happens that the clergyman, in consequence of some acquaintance with modern science and scholarship, puts upon the words which he repeats a sense which they did not formerly convey, he is liable to be charged with pursuing a course that is inconsistent with a high standard of sincerity. The charge has, indeed, been actually made by some occupying positions of authority in the Church. But whether the accusation is preferred in so many words or not, it is obvious that the prevalence of a feeling that the clergy who are in sympathy with what, for the sake of brevity, may be styled modernist views, are lacking in honesty is bound to be injurious to their influence and usefulness. Moreover, the reflection that they are laying themselves open to such an imputation may well deter from seeking Orders many intellectual and sensitive men who might otherwise be disposed to do so. Accordingly it seems desirable to sift the justice of this accusation of unveracity brought against those clergy who, in place of accepting all the words of the creeds in a literal sense, attach to certain of their clauses a figurative or transferred meaning. If an adequate defence for such departure from the literal and traditional import of the clauses in question is to be established, it must be based upon principles which are recognised as valid in other

[1] The appearance of this paper after Dr. Sanday's in the October number, in which some of the points here urged were presented more effectively, may seem to require an apology. But the present paper was written in the summer; and since it treats the subject, in the main, on different lines from Dr. Sanday's, its publication, perhaps, admits of excuse.

connections. The beliefs expressed in the creeds are affirmed through the medium of language, and a tendency to change of meaning observable in language generally is not suspended when it is employed in the service of theology, A latitude of signification, or a decided shifting of signification, which is acknowledged to have taken place in particular terms when such are used under ordinary conditions, cannot reasonably be disallowed in connection with religious formularies.

But before proceeding to attempt such a defence, it is expedient to say a word about two alternative ways of regarding the situation. On the one hand, some are sanguine enough to entertain the hope that the words of the creeds may be re-cast, and that the essential truths which are affirmed in them may be re-stated in a form more closely accordant with modern scientific and critical conclusions. And no doubt ideally it would be best for every substantial variation of collective belief within a religious community to receive fresh and appropriate expression. But to hope that in the Anglican Church such a consummation, however devoutly to be wished, is within reach is, in the opinion of the present writer, to harbour a delusion. The conservative spirit of the Church, which has rendered the initiation of Prayer Book revision so belated, and its accomplishment so slow, even though much of the Prayer Book is only a few centuries old, is not likely to countenance alterations in those portions of it which, like the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, have a history behind them of more than a thousand years. In addition, party feeling is rife in the Church; and one influential section, from which better things might have been expected, is in alliance with a second, to which otherwise it is hostile, to buttress obscurantism with all the zeal of unreflecting partizanship and all the resources of an extensive organization. Nor must the fact be overlooked that the ancient creeds, though they cannot fail to mean different things to different minds, are external symbols of unity, and help to keep together, for various important ends, groups which might be sundered by any attempt at revising such venerable documents

On the other hand, there are some who find satisfaction in the thought that, when a clergyman repeats the creed in the course of a service, he does so in a representative sense. This, no doubt, is, in a measure, true. The repetition of the creeds in the morning and evening offices, and in the communion office is an act of corporate worship, and the minister therein represents the congregation. Nevertheless he cannot wholly dissociate himself from those whose spokesman he is. He discharges the duty of representing them on the understanding that there are certain religious convictions and aspirations which are common to him and them. He clearly shares the responsibility belonging to the corporate acts in which he takes so prominent a part. He participates in the affirmations of the creeds as he participates in the petitions of the prayers; and it is unreasonable to absolve him from all accountability for what he says in the discharge of his official functions. The words he employs must be held to express some personal desires and some personal beliefs of his own. But his responsibility is qualified by two considerations. In the first place, he, like every other individual in the congregation, uses a service-book which not only has come down from a time very different from our own, and therefore must in some respects be out of touch with the modern spirit, but is also meant to meet collective needs, and so is bound to be imperfectly adapted to individual requirements. Consequently in the employment of it by all alike there is inevitably involved a certain degree of insincerity, which extends to the lay members of a congregation equally with the clergyman. Everyone uses here and there phrases which do not correspond to his real convictions, feelings, and desires. And secondly, the clergyman in particular is generally better educated than a large proportion of his people. Some of the words which he has to employ in the course of the services convey to him much fuller meanings than they do to a section of his congregation. Other terms carry for him an import quite different from that which they have for the unlettered. It is therefore manifestly unfair that he should be expected to put

upon such only the meaning which they may have once had for all, but which they now have for none but the ill-informed, and that he should be reckoned insincere if he fails to do so. Certain of these words occur in the creeds; and the change of significance which they have undergone cannot be ignored at the bidding of either Catholic or Evangelical literalists.

A thorough investigation of the variation of sense which has occurred in connection with the principal terms employed in the creeds during the history of scientific and philosophic thought would be certain to lead to interesting results. It is only necessary to instance from the Athanasian Creed the word *substance* to understand what varieties of meaning a single term may embrace, and how widely divergent from the sense originally implied is that which is probably given to it by many of the ordinary worshippers in our churches.[1] Again, it needs little reflection to recognize how differently the words in the Nicene Creed relating to the Holy Spirit, *who spake by the prophets*, are interpreted by one who retains a belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and by one who has studied the Old Testament in the light of modern critical research. But it is not needful to go for an illustration outside the first article of the Apostles' Creed. Who can fail to realise the difference between the signification which the clause *maker of heaven and earth* now has for educated persons, and that which it has for the untaught? Those who drew up the creed took their views of creation from the opening chapter of the book of Genesis where the world is represented as made in six days; and we can see how the process whereby the various existing kinds of living creatures came into being was conceived some 250 years

[1] Another example is the word *Person*. Probably many professedly orthodox Churchmen understand the Trinity in a tritheistic sense. Yet according to St. Augustine the Holy Ghost, one of the Three Persons of the Trinity, is "the love wherewith the Father loves the Son and the Son the Father" (see Dr. Rashdall's *Doctrine and Development*, p. 21 foll.). It is well to remember that the Greek equivalent for the Latin *Persona*, as used in the Athanasian Creed, is *Hypostasis*. In the case of "Theological" terms such as these the educated man is likely to give to them a significance nearer the original than that which the uneducated attaches to them. But in the case of many words, the import of which the progress of knowledge in recent years has vastly enlarged or modified, it is the ill-educated man who, in his understanding of them, will come nearest to the sense which they once possessed.

ago by a man of Milton's intellectual calibre, if we glance at the seventh book of *Paradise Lost*.[1]

At the present time all persons of average education accept the scientific view that the Universe has been evolved from something like a nebula, and that man himself has been developed from some very lowly organism, in the course of millions of years. But since the word *Maker* is sufficiently undefined to cover both the ancient and the modern belief, it will be best for the immediate purpose to take the two words *hell* and *heaven,* and to consider how the progress of knowledge has affected their significance.

It may be observed, to begin with, that the first affords a conspicuous example of the fact to which attention has already been called, that to the clergy some of the words of the creeds are likely to convey a different meaning from that which they have for the man in the street. They, as persons who have some acquaintance with the languages current in the early Church, are aware that in the creed *hell* is the equivalent of the Greek *Hades* and of the Hebrew *Sheol*, not of *Gehenna;* whereas it is only the sense that the last word had which the ordinary man ascribes to the English word *hell*.[2] Consequently in reciting the clause *He descended into hell*, the clergyman puts, and cannot but put, a meaning upon the English term which in ordinary usage it does not bear: he treats it as though

[1] See Bk. vii., 450 ff. The passage deserves to be quoted in full, but only part can be reproduced here:—

> "The sixth, and of creation last, arose
> With evening harps and matin, when God said:
> Let the earth bring forth soul living in her kind.
> . . . . The earth obeyed, and straight
> Opening her fertile womb, teem'd at a birth
> Innumerous living creatures, perfect forms.
> . . . . . .
> The grassy clods now calved: now half appeared
> The tawny lion, pawing to get free
> His hinder parts; then springs, as broke from bonds,
> And rampant shakes his brinded mane: the ounce,
> The libbard, and the tiger, as the mole
> Rising, the crumbled earth above them threw
> In hillocks. . . ."

[2] The clause *descended into hell* only occurs in the Latin creeds; but *descendit in infernum* (or *ad inferna*) is a rendering of Hebrew and Greek Old Testament phrases containing respectively the words *Sheol* and *Hades*.—See Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 59.

it were written between inverted commas, as common words customarily are, when employed in an uncommon sense. In the next place the ideas which the word *hell* (or *Hades*) and *heaven* conveyed to the compilers of the creeds were Biblical and Hebraic. The prevailing Biblical conception of Hades, of Heaven, and of the relation of both of them to the earth was that Heaven was above a solid "firmament" (corresponding to what we call the sky) over-arching the earth (conceived as a flat disc), and that Hades was a locality situated far beneath the earth's surface. On the earth men had their abode. In Heaven God dwelt; from thence He beheld the children of men; and from thence He Himself came down (sometimes in the likeness of man, more often concealed from human sight in a cloud of glory), or else dispatched His angels to do His errands. Accordingly visitants from heaven to earth "descended" when they came, and "ascended" when they returned. On the other hand, men when they died, "descended" from the earth into Hades, a region where they were equally severed from God and from the world of living humanity.

It cannot, however, be supposed that Jewish conceptions respecting Heaven and Hell remained quite stationary. As prevalent ideas concerning God became increasingly spiritualized, the conception of Him as being in any intelligible sense localized must have grown more and more impossible for reflective minds.[1] Nevertheless, early habits of speech are everywhere apt to persist; and persons or things that came from God continued to be described as "descending" from Him, whilst those that went to Him were similarly said to "ascend." In like manner the dead continued to "descend" into "Hell" or Hades. But if such terms, even for those whose knowledge both of the "firmament" and of the earth, were certainly defective, tended to shed their local associations and to be understood in a symbolical sense, still more must they have this latter sense for us, who have acquired far more accurate ideas of the Universe.

[1] cf., for example, *Ps. cxxxix.* 7, 8.

It is quite impossible now for any to think seriously of Heaven, with the meaning of God's abode, in local or spatial terms at all. To do so would be to place ourselves on the level of theological thought manifested by the astronomer who swept the heavens with his telescope and declared that he could find no God in them. We lift up our hearts, not our eyes. When, in accordance with our several ecclesiastical proclivities, we think of departed friends as having at death gone to God, or to Paradise (believed to be one of the regions included in Hades), we do not really suppose that their souls have literally ascended or descended. We think of them as having experienced, in Bishop Westcott's words, "not a change of place, but a change of state." But this way of regarding "*Hell*" and *Heaven*, and the passage to them, clearly must control the signification we attach to the words in the creed, *He* (Christ) *descended into "Hell," He ascended into Heaven.*

It is in respect of the Ascension that the figurative interpretation principally receives the censure of literalists. Yet in the clause *He ascended into Heaven*, can the last word signify anything else except the Presence of God? Is it possible for it in such a connection to mean at the same time the sky? To introduce into our thoughts about the Ascension spatial notions seems an impertinence, if not a profanity. To imagine that Our Lord physically rose "upwards," from where His disciples were gathered together, towards that region of space which at a particular moment was "over" a particular spot on the surface of Palestine, as the globe turned on its axis, is to treat most irreverently a subject claiming deepest reverence. Far preferably for religious as well as critical reasons, to such a way of regarding what is recorded in Acts i., 9-11 is the assumption that the original account used by St. Luke was written in the characteristic spirit of the Old Testament scriptures, that is, symbolically. A little reflection shows this. The cloud that "received" our Lord is obviously analogous to the cloud that overshadowed Him and His apostles in the story of the Transfiguration; and both are based on the

conception of the cloud that is represented as the symbol of Jehovah in the Pentateuch and elsewhere. (See Ex. xxiv., 16, etc.) The angels who addressed the disciples, like the angel who stood by, and spoke to, St. Paul on the ship (Acts xxvii. *27*), or like the angel that talked with the Prophet Zechariah (Zech. i. 9 etc.), are most naturally interpreted as symbolising the conviction that the beliefs of which the disciples became possessed had a divine source: they came from God. The only element in the recital as it stands which jars with such a metaphorical interpretation is found in the words *while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as He went.* The presence of these can be explained without great violence by the assumption that the account in transmission has been slightly amplified by some prosaic mind that has partially converted a symbolic narrative into a matter-of-fact record.

The same considerations that lead to a figurative interpretation of the Ascension govern the interpretation of the clause relating to the Return. It wants little thought to see how difficult it is to harmonize any actual and visible "descent" of Christ from Heaven as the Judge of mankind with the real conditions of the Universe as we know them. What intelligible idea, for instance, can we form of His appearing visibly to all human eyes at once, when we consider that the earth is a rotating sphere? We cannot revert to a by-gone standpoint. To claim that at the present day we should interpret the description of His Return with the same literalness that may have prevailed in the early centuries, when the nature of the world was so imperfectly understood, is to claim that educated men should keep their scientific knowledge and their religious beliefs in separate mental compartments, each hermetically sealed against any influence of the one upon the other. To acquiesce in such a claim is to surrender thought itself, for thinking at least must aim at coherency. Moreover, a literal interpretation of the two clauses just considered destroys all consistency between them and the clause that intervenes. Few will venture to demand that the language relating to the

Session should be understoood literally, for to take *au pied de la lettre* the words *He sitteth at the right hand of the Father* leads at once to the impiety of ascribing to God the Father a body and limbs. The clause, by general consent, is understood figuratively, and is explained to mean, in St. Augustine's words, *in summa beatitudine.* But it is extremely hard to see how these three successive clauses can be interpreted otherwise than on one and the same principle. They respectively refer to entrance into, rest in, and a return from, Heaven; and if one of them must be understood metaphorically, the same method of interpretation cannot be denied to the other two.

The situation with regard to the clause relating to the *Resurrection of the body* is different. We have no more knowledge at the present time of the state after death than was possessed in the early centuries of the Church. Consequently, when we express our belief in the Resurrection of the body, we are not in a position to decide very confidently what meaning the words ought to bear.

On the one hand, the materiality which we associate with the word body seems altogether incompatible with the conditions of a world wholly spiritual.[1] On the other hand, we are so accustomed, in thinking of different personalities, to visualize them to ourselves, that it is difficult for ordinary minds to form any conception of how personal identity can be preserved without introducing into their conceptions something corresponding to body. But grave objections stand in the way of belief in the Resurrection of the body as soon as it is explained to mean the actual resuscitation of the same physical frame that is laid in the grave, and undergoes corruption. It is needless to recall the fact that the elements of which human bodies consist are likely, sooner or later, to enter into the constitution of other things and other persons. Fortunately English Churchmen are not tied down to this explanation. For in the English version of the Apostles' Creed, recited at Morning and Evening Prayer, a departure is made from the

[1] Cf. the implication in *St. Luke xx.* 35.

terminology of the original. The latter, in the last clause but one, had *carnis resurrectionem*, and the version of Aquileia even had *huius carnis resurrectionem*. This is in flagrant contradiction to St. Paul's declaration that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; and it was perhaps owing to a perception of this that the other phrase in 1552 was substituted in the English Prayer Book. The term *body* is vague and more indeterminate than the word *flesh* (St. Paul could even speak of a *spiritual body*), and by the substitution we are saved from affirming our belief in something that is not easily credible.

The clause in the creed which offers the greatest obstacle to any but the traditional interpretation is that which affirms belief in the Virgin birth. It must be allowed that here the traditional meaning is still the most obvious meaning, and that the words which were intended originally to exclude human fatherhood still most naturally convey that sense. The belief, however, rests upon narratives occurring only in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and, in the opinion of many, is discountenanced by the evidence of St. Paul. In *St. Matthew* i., 23, our Lord's birth is brought into connection with the prediction in *Is.* vii., 14, where the LXX. renders the Hebrew *almah* by *parthenos* instead of the more appropriate *neanis*, used by the other Greek versions. It is possible, therefore, that the narrative has arisen from the term *parthenos* being understood in a literal sense, the LXX. being currently used. Dr. Sanday has observed that the idea implied is pagan rather than Jewish; and certainly the parallels suggested by classical mythology, if painful, are inevitable.[1] In the O.T.

[1] Against the view that pagan ideas underlie the narrative in *St. Matt.* i, 18-25 it can, no doubt, be urged with some force that the first gospel is intensely Hebraic, and that the narrative relating to the Virgin birth is as Hebraic as the surrounding context (see A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matt.*, pp. 11, 12). On the other hand, that an account based on a literal but erroneous interpretation of the term *parthenos* in *Is.* vii., 14, *might* find currency even in Hebraic circles appears from the circumstance that a literal but certainly erroneous interpretation cf. *Zech.* ix., 9, occurs in *St. Matt.* xxi., 6, 7, where the Hebrew parallelism of the original is misunderstood. The popular construction to which the literal acceptance of the Virgin birth is liable becomes manifest from the place assigned in the Roman church to the Mother by the side of the Father and the Son.—cf. C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, p. 238.

books, so far as can be judged, the Jewish conception of divine fatherhood consisted in divine favour and protection (see 2 Sam., vii., 14, 15, Ps. lxxx., 26, 27); and this "moral" relationship is implicit in the significant passage Ps. ii., 7, 8. Of what constitutes divine sonship an idea may be derived from our Lord's words in Matt. v., 44, 45, which appear to place it in perfection of character. But even those who take a favourable view of the evidence supporting the traditional interpretation of the clause in the creed must admit that, notwithstanding the fact that the traditional is the natural sense, those who are dissatisfied with the evidence, and doubt our Lord's birth of a Virgin mother, can yet give to the clause in qnestion a defensible meaning, on a principle acted upon elsewhere. To anyone who thinks that the narrative in Matt. i. 18-25 had its origin, directly or indirectly, in the prediction contained in Is. vii. 14, it is open to understand the words *born of the Virgin Mary,* to signify that His mother was "the Virgin" of Isaiah's prophecy.[1] It has already been shown that most educated men, in reciting the creed, are compelled to put tacitly the word *hell* between inverted commas. Nor is this all. The same is true (if the point is worth pressing) in regard to the epithet *holy* as applied to the Catholic Church; for the Church is only "holy" ideally, not actually. The interpretation, therefore, of the words *the Virgin* as though they were written "*the Virgin*" is one that has parallels within the creed itself.

It is over this clause that the dispute about the honesty of modernist clergy will be most acute; and it is desirable, in conclusion, to face the question of loss and gain, if any appreciable proportion of these come to feel that their place ought to be outside the ranks of our Church's official ministry. The *gain* that would accrue is the relief of tender consciences, and on such a point it is the indefeasible right of every individual to judge for himself. At the same time it is permissible to remind those whose consciences worry them of the opinion expressed by John Stuart Mill that it was honest for men to remain within the Church "so long as they are able to accept its articles and confessions in any sense, or with any interpretation, consistent with common honesty, *whether it be*

[1] Cf. Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, p. 130.

the generally received interpretation or not."[1] In every process of transition as regards the meaning of terms, some individuals are bound to be, for a while, in advance of popular usage. On the other hand, the *loss* involved would fall on the Church at large, and would (in the writer's opinion) be serious. The present age is one in which hard and fast lines of division are being obliterated alike in the natural sciences and in theology. In the latter it is being increasingly realised to be undesirable to maintain rigid definitions in connection with things divine which are incapable of being satisfactorily defined in human speech. Theological terms are in solution, and are losing their sharpness of edge. This is a process which will certainly go on outside the Church: if there is no corresponding movement within the Church, or if those who have hitherto promoted such withdraw from the Church, the gap between the Church and the intellectual world, wide enough as it is, will be enlarged, to the detriment of both.

Human life has been defined as fellowship; and if this is true generally, it is especially true of religious life. Should educated men whose religious sympathies, for various reasons, are with the Anglican Church, find themselves less and less at home in it, their lives will be the poorer for it. But it will be impossible for such to obtain any true satisfaction for their spiritual needs within a Church which by a rigorous interpretation of its ancient formularies does violence to their intellectual nature. And since the creeds are not likely to be abandoned or verbally altered, the reasonable course is to interpret them not literally but liberally. The movement, however, in this direction will be arrested if those who are most in accord with it retire from the Church or from positions of influence in it. To do so would be to aid the efforts of those who are seeking to destroy that quality of comprehensiveness for which (it has been said) the Anglican Church most distinctively stands.[2] Comprehensiveness secures both the union necessary for moral and social progress and the liberty essential for the pursuit of truth; and it will be an evil day for religion in this country if our Church's character in this respect is impaired by any rash action on the part of the liberal theologians among its present clergy.

[1] The italics are the present writer's.

[2] The words, which are quoted from memory, occur in a book by the Rev. B. H. Streeter.

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I.—His World.

By Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Rector of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

The modern Churchman is becoming more and more conscious of his principles and his aims. He fills a definite place in our Church life. He displays certain characteristics which at once mark him off from Churchmen of other schools of thought. He feels that he has a definite mission to fulfil, and a message to deliver. I do not want to begin by trying to define too precisely what I mean by a modern Churchman. I hope that the definition will shape itself as we proceed, rather my object is to discuss what I have ventured to call the outfit of the modern Churchman, and by that I mean the varied equipment of belief and of practice which he brings to his task, the attitude which he feels compelled to take up in regard to some of the great questions that affect the position of Christianity in the world to-day, the contribution which he is able to make to religious life and thought.

The way in which I have divided the subject will enable us to cover a great part, if not the whole of the ground, and it will, I hope, have another result. It may help to remove a misunderstanding which is very common. It is often suggested that the modern Churchman has given up so much which other Churchmen value, that he has all but forfeited the right to be called a Churchman at all. His position is regarded as vague and indefinite; his attitude as one of denial rather than of affirmation. Now what I shall hope to show is that this is far from being the case. On each one of the points which I have chosen for discussion, the modern Churchman has a positive view. He takes a definite standpoint. He means something which is real and constructive, though it may be different from that which has held the field before.

To begin with his world. It may seem to be going outside the limits of our subject altogether to start with that, but after all it is of the very first importance to understand the conception that a man has of the world in which he lives, before we can estimate the value of the contribution which he tries to make to it. There is of course a sense in which we all live in the same world. The facts of outward nature are the same for all of us. We are all living at the same stage in human history. Human society has reached a certain point in its social, economic and moral development, and at that point our lives have to be lived. The field of man's knowledge and the accumulated results of his experience form a great body of facts which are independent of our personal attitude to them. In that sense at any rate the modern Churchman lives in the same and in no other world than that in which other Churchmen, and those who are not Churchmen at all, have got to live.

But there is another sense in which each one of us lives in a world of his own. The world is not the same to the young as it is to the old; it is not the same to the weak as it is to the strong; to the poor as it is to the rich; to the unlearned as it is to the educated; to the unbeliever as it is to the man of faith. We make our own world to some extent by what we ourselves bring to its interpretation. In that sense we can speak of the modern Churchman's world. His conception of the world, his attitude towards it, the world in which he may be really said to live, is something which is his own. It has certain clear and definite characteristics which other men and other Churchmen do not share with him. Now what are these characteristics? In the first place it is the modern world. The modern Churchman lives in the present. He feels that a great change has come over human life and human thought since the old forms of the Church's faith and worship were first drawn up, and he is prepared to give full value to that change. It seems only a commonplace to say that we are not living in the first six centuries of the Church's life,—nor in the Middle ages, nor in the upheaval of the Reformation, but it is

one of those commonplace truths which have to be repeated. The modern Churchman will not attempt to make the standards of these earlier times the rule for the Church's life to-day, and more than that, when he sees others making that attempt, he will try to point out their mistake. He is convinced to begin with that in every age the Church must adapt its methods to the facts of contemporary life. It must speak the language of the day. It must reform and readjust its machinery to the varying needs of men. And it can never be helped but only hindered in this by being bound to the standards of other ages.

Secondly, the world of the modern Churchman is the world as it has been explored and discovered by all the different efforts of human thought and enquiry. He must take account of history in its latest interpretation, of science pressed to its last achievement. It is a cardinal article of his creed that all truth is one and that there can be no irreconcilable conflict between what is true in one department of life and what is true in another. He must be prepared to find room for every new fact that is brought to light. And the world as it is revealed to him now by science and discovery is one which is governed more and more by law, one in which all the processes of nature are being reduced to order and more closely related one to another. So there are many factors which have played a great part in the religion of other times, which are gradually being left behind. The belief in physical miracle, in the sense of a suspension or violation of a known law, can play far less a part, if it has not got to be abandoned altogether. The tyranny of superstition, which has held almost undisputed sway over men's minds, has been finally broken. The relics of magic, which have survived even in the most advanced religions, are discredited. Those immoral and irrational ideas, which have entered so largely into religion and have influenced both belief and practice, must sooner or later be given up.

Thirdly, the modern Churchman sees that the world in which he lives needs the close co-operation of all the moral and spiritual forces which it possesses, if it is to be saved from

disaster. The forces of evil are so strong, the structure of materialism is so solid, the attractions and temptations of the things that are seen and are temporal, are so overwhelming, that nothing less than the union of all that is moral and spiritual will be able to counteract those influences. And so anything that hinders that co-operation must be wrong. It is treason to God. The controversies which at present divide the spiritual forces of the world, especially those which divide the Christian Church, seem to be so much waste of effort. They cannot be worth while compared with the greatness of the task that lies ahead. So the modern Churchman will be eager to welcome any movement which is calculated to draw together those spiritual forces even though it seems to break through long-established tradition, and he will be very suspicious of the exclusiveness, the intolerance, the bigotry which are still so firmly entrenched in many branches of the Christian Church.

And, finally, the modern Churchman does not regard the world as something about which he need despair. There have been times when the Christian Church has held itself aloof from the world, has taught that the way of safety lay in withdrawing from the world, has spoken of the world as if it had been altogether given over to darkness. Whatever excuse there may have been for such a point of view once, nay, whatever excuse there may be for it now, it is one which the modern Churchman cannot adopt. Great as the task is, he believes that it is the world that is the object of redemption, and that it is still by faith, by love, by service, and only by these, that the world will yet be saved. Faith and love and service found their supreme expression in Christ. They are His redeeming work. They are His legacy to His Church. They are the surest evidence that His Spirit is at work. They are the only powers that are strong enough to storm the citadel of evil and to lead the world back to God.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERICAL MIND.*

By the Rev. H. D. A. Major, M.A., Vice-Principal
of Ripon Clergy College.

The two chief subjects of discussion at our Conference are Christian education and Christian unity. Not the least important question connected with these is whether the Church is giving her future clergy that kind of mental training which will make them efficient Christian teachers and active and successful agents in the task of procuring Christian union. I do not think she is. Our theological colleges may do much to deepen their members' sense of vocation; to discipline their habits; to deepen their spiritual life; but for the most part they do little to train them as thinkers and teachers; they do little to widen their minds and enlarge their hearts. Our theological colleges do not as a rule turn out young clergymen eager to gain a fuller knowledge of the truth, and keenly anxious to make all mankind one in Christ. In some cases it must be confessed that the tendency of the theological college training is obscurantist and separatist, and in almost all cases, owing to certain causes with which I shall deal, the intellectual training is quite inadequate.

First, let it be noted that the theological colleges are by no means altogether to blame for this. When a deputation of members of Parliament and important Churchmen said in effect to the present Archbishop of Canterbury a few years ago, "Look at the kind of men the theological colleges are turning out." His Grace replied:—"Very true, but you should see those men when they go in."

The theological college is but a half-way house, where in most cases men stay but one brief year before Ordination. Therefore what they are before they enter, has much to do with what they are after they leave. In this paper I confine myself to graduate theological colleges, and to the intellectual

* A paper read at the Rugby Conference.

training given in them, as I have taught in one of them for the last ten years. Before the theological college comes the University, after the theological college comes the Deacons' and Priests' examinations. Most of the men who enter theological colleges have, I believe, no particular intellectual interests. This is partly due to the men themselves, and it is partly due to the systems under which the majority of them are trained at the public schools and Universities.* These systems foster splendid and indispensable qualities which are of great use in all the public services, and not least in the ministry of the Church, but they are weak on the intellectual side. However, be that as it may, "the things of the mind" do not bulk large for most young men entering a theological college. Yet these young men have before them an intellectual task which if it is to be successfully accomplished demands serious intellectual training. They have got to teach the Christian faith in a singularly difficult and exacting age. After all, they would say, they come to a theological college to be prepared to become clergymen. They desire the devotional, and liturgical, and parochial, and vocal, and sermonic training which they believe the theological college can give. As for their intellectual training they desire to satisfy the examiners for Deacons' Orders, and they too often assume that having done that, they have for all practical purposes finished with the studious life for ever. Theology may now be thrown aside—at least as soon as their Priests' examination is also past—and thereafter their religious reading need not extend beyond commentaries and sermons, and the weekly Church newspaper. I do not blame them severely for this. For like most Englishmen, they "hate ideas." They admire the practical life. Few indeed have the ideal of the clergyman as pre-eminently a Christian teacher.

That great Churchman and pioneer, George Augustus Selwyn, the first bishop of New Zealand, laid this down as his ministerial and educational ideal:—

* On the whole I have found the Pass Degree man from the newer University more keen intellectually than the Pass Degree man from Oxford or Cambridge.

> "Every clergyman must be a schoolmaster, and it is the object of the diocesan system to provide that every schoolmaster shall become a clergyman. The great point to be kept steadily in view is to sanctify the work of teaching, by connecting it in act or in hope, with the ministry of the Church of Christ."*

In citing this passage I do not wish to suggest that every clergyman should be a schoolmaster or *vice versa.* but simply to emphasize the supreme importance of the teaching function in the clerical life.

That ideal—the clergyman as Christian teacher—whether in the Universities, the public schools, or in the country generally, is being steadily lost. Indeed it has in some measure been killed by the extraordinary prominence which the Anglo-Catholic movement has given to the ideal of the clergyman as priest, and to the more modern ideals of the clergyman as financier, organizer, athlete, public entertainer, and social reformer. Until therefore we can get a prominent place for the ideal in our theological colleges of the clergyman as teacher—a teacher of the very highest and most efficient kind—a teacher of the Christian faith in all its extraordinary depth and many-sidedness, there is little hope of intellectual training receiving much attention from our ordinands and the theological college authorities.

The episcopate has a serious responsibility in this matter, for the bishops are finally responsible for the style and standard of the Deacons' examination, and the Deacons' examination dominates the intellectual life of the theological college. Yet is the Deacons' examination calculated to make the ordinand a really efficient Christian teacher in this time of stress and strain? I cannot think so. The Deacons' examination requires a general and, in most cases, superficial knowledge of the Bible with a more precise knowledge of several books of the New Testament in Greek and of the Old Testament in English. It demands a fair knowledge of the contents of the Prayer Book and its history, together with a more exacting knowledge of the Anglican dogmatic formularies, particularly the XXXIX. Articles. It also requires a general knowledge of

* J. King Davis: *History of St. John's College, N.Z.*, p. 54.

early Church history and English Church history, together with the ability to translate a set book from a Latin ecclesiastical writer. The object of this examination is doubtless to secure that the ordinand shall have a knowledge of the books which he is to use in the Church Services, and such a general understanding of the history and principles of the society of which he is to be appointed an officer that he may be able to make an intelligent use of its rites and institutions, and to teach the faithful laity to do the same. Now the present curriculum and the object at which it aims may be sufficient for a very firmly established Christian society in times of intellectual inertia, but it is far from being adequate in days when mental disquietude and religious questionings are on every side, and the Christian Church itself is on trial. The Priests' examination, by including apologetics and some branch of sociology, does something to extend the range of intellectual interest, but these studies owing to the demands of parish work, are often so perfunctorily performed, that they can leave but little permanent impression on their student.

What is clear is that the course of study prescribed for our ordinands is very inadequate, and by no means fits them to contend successfully with the modern religious situation. What is the use of badly-trained, imperfectly equipped troops in modern warfare? Better one highly trained and properly armed warrior than ten of such rabble, is the verdict of the military commander. This is what Sir Thomas More saw so clearly in his *Utopia*. Hence the priests in that land were to be few but highly gifted.

It lies with the bishops to take the necessary steps to meet the modern situation, for they prescribe the conditions of admission to orders. No doubt they will urge in excuse that the falling number of ordinands, their reduced means, their lessening mental power, demand a low standard of admission. This however is a vicious circle. The inadequacy of the clergy to meet the modern situation is in too many cases the cause of the poor type of ordinand. Moreover, if the

Roman, Scotch, and Nonconformist communions can get their ordinands to spend two, four or more years in theological study, why cannot the English Church with its great resources? Is it because our episcopate does not recognise the urgent necessity for such a policy, and weakly yields to the demand for curates, although properly trained curates are not forthcoming?

Besides our narrow and inadequate curriculum there is the further evil of a bad method of teaching. The teacher is forced to give most of his attention to details—doctrinal, historical, liturgical, philological—and the student has little time for anything else in his studies. Compelled to waste much precious time over these details, he consequently either neglects or blurs great fundamental principles. Moreover, the teacher has to begin too often in the middle of the subjects, and his teaching, due to the exigencies of the situation, is dogmatic rather than scientific.

We need to begin at the beginning; to begin with fundamental facts and principles; to begin widely, with great sweeps, bold outlines, daring generalisations, and leave details until afterwards, or use them mainly for purposes of illustration. We ought at the outset to take our student up in an aeroplane and shew him the lie of the country—its vast extent, its noble prospects, its difficulties and unexplored regions. There is no subject which so lends itself to that as the subject of religion. It is extraordinarily interesting and stimulating and most truly educative if taught in the right way. Now what is the right way? This for the modern ordinand is not the scholastic way.

In 1857—nearly sixty years ago—Archbishop Temple wrote:—

> "Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mode, *i.e.*, all based on logic. We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain; but nothing can prevent it."

This forecast of Dr. Temple has not received the attention it deserves by those responsible for the theological training of our ordinands. It is, I confess, easier to point out evils than to

cure them. I should not, however, have pointed out the evils were I not convinced that the remedy is neither hard to find nor impossible to apply. The method of teaching the Christian religion to our ordinands should be as far as possible historical, psychological, and philosophical.

We ought to begin with carefully arranged courses of lectures on the History of Religion, Comparative Religion, the Psychology of Religion, and conclude with a simple outline of a Philosophy of Religion. There are now-a-days a number of magnificent text books on these subjects—concise, comprehensive, inspiring.

Such courses would do much to widen the student's outlook, to deepen his thought, to enlarge his heart, to stimulate his imagination. They would make him ask fundamental questions, and they would offer him most suggestive solutions of many of them. Above all they would present him with the right method of attacking them.

Of course this kind of teaching places great strain and responsibility upon the teacher. No dry-as-dust professors, no timid, tepid, unenthusiastic exponents of a multitude of conflicting theories, no teacher who cannot see the wood for the trees, and who does not realise the essential qualities of the Christian religion, will do to teach these subjects to ordinands. The teacher must have knowledge, and he must have enthusiasm; he must have the scientific method, and he must have a powerful imagination; he must have courage, and he must have a deep sense of responsibility; and, above all, he must be a whole-hearted Christian.

I am placing much on the teacher. My excuse for this is found in the words of a letter written by Erasmus to Colet describing the ideal schoolmaster. Erasmus concludes his description by saying:—

> "But you will say what a load you are putting on the poor teacher! It is so; but I burden the one to relieve the many."*

* F. Seebohm: *The Oxford Reformers*, p. 134 (Everyman's Library).

The second stage in my ideal curriculum would consist of the historical study of the Religion of Israel. This would necessarily include a general critical study of significant passages selected from its canonical, apocryphal and pseud-epigraphical books, to illustrate the stages of religious and moral development.

The third stage would consist of a careful study of the life and teaching of our Lord, and would of course involve a comparative study of the Gospels. This would be followed by an outline study of the development of doctrine within the period of the New Testament, and a review of the causes and methods of the expansion of the Christian Church in the first three centuries. In these studies I should do everything to encourage the use of the Greek Testament, but should make it optional, not compulsory, for examination purposes. Latin I should frankly discard.

The fourth and last stage would deal with the application of our Lord's principles to our modern ecclesiastical, social, economic and international problems.

Such courses of study conducted by competent and enthusiastic teachers, with the aid of carefully selected text books, would develop in the great majority of our more intellectual graduate ordinands the three things so greatly needed to make them capable and comprehensive Christian teachers, viz., a wide range of vision, the scientific temper and method, the realisation of the essential nature of our Lord's principles. I am perfectly convinced that with the growth of these the obscurantism and sectarianism of our Churchmanship would disappear.

Such a course would probably require two years to cover it. As for the subjects which are at present taken for the Deacons' examination, where not already included in the proposed course, I should put them into the Priests' course, and take precautions that no incumbent should be permitted to offer a title who would not first promise to take every care to encourage studious habits in his deacon curate.

Some may suppose that I have some notion of making every graduate ordained an "intellectual." Now I regard this as neither possible nor desirable. I do wish, however, for our young graduate clergyman that he should have an intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of modern religious problems; that he should be interested in and quite fearless towards modern research and speculation; that he should possess a power of steady intellectual growth, and have as little as possible to unlearn; that he should be a real help to many who are drifting away into the evil states of materialism and scepticism, or into the lesser goods of Christian Science, Theosophy and Higher Thought; that he should realise what is the essence and supreme value of the Christian Faith.

At first, no doubt, the result of this intellectual training might be to leave the young clergyman with too many theories and too few facts at his command, but growing knowledge and widening experience would teach him to pluck feathers from the wings of his imagination and to stick them into the tail of his judgment. Such teaching might also make him somewhat impatient, possibly contemptuous, of a good deal of theological and Biblical knowledge which goes by that name in certain circles at present, but the growth in him of that love and wisdom which builds up would soon replace the spirit which puffs up.

I do not suppose for one moment that the episcopate as a body could be got to adopt the suggestions made in this paper, but perhaps some of the bishops might be willing to try it, and perhaps several of the theological colleges might be got to co-operate with them and with each other.

There is, I think, no better service that some of our wealthy laymen could render to the Church at present than to endow lectureships and provide exhibitions in the theological colleges to enable this kind of teaching to be given and received. I am convinced that the potency and impotency of our ministry as a teaching body largely depends upon our theological colleges and the Bishops' requirements for Deacons' and Priests' examinations.

Theology has advanced enormously during the last twenty-five years, yet there has been hardly any corresponding change in the Deacons' and Priests' curricula. If the suggestions made in this paper were adopted, a few years hence would witness a vast change for the better in the relations of the different parties within the English Church herself and a great extension of her influence over the more intelligent portions of the nation; her relations with other Christian bodies would be sensibly improved, and the power of her foreign missions to the civilised heathen enormously increased.*

REVIEWS.

THE FAITH AND THE WAR.†

Those who edit for us the various books which form the New Testament are accustomed to devote a section in their introductions to the consideration of the question, "For what readers?" any particular book was written. And, where the answer can be given with any measure of probability, it is usually of importance.

So in regard to this series of Essays, edited by Canon Foakes-Jackson at the request of the Council of the Churchmen's Union, it is of no little moment to remember that it is intended for a particular class of readers, under the special circumstances of the time. From their standpoint, from the degree to which the several writers have entered into their mood and met their difficulties, the book must be estimated. And though, as the Introduction reminds us, the writers are ten in number and differ considerably among themselves, still the book is a unity and, as such, must appeal specially to one type or phase of mind. We shall attempt to describe the reader whom these Essayists seem to have in view, before we proceed to consider what measure of gain and encouragement he may be expected to derive from the pages they have written.

* Since writing this paper I have been introduced to a most valuable article by the late Canon Barnett on *The Neglect of the Teaching Function of the Clergy*, printed in the Churchmen's Union Occasional Papers, No. 1 (1901). In it he says: "The clergy are organisers; they are relieving officers; they are caterers of amusement; they are guides to philanthropists; they are social reformers, but they are not teachers stimulating the thought of the people. They cannot with all their doings be students; and no one who is not himself a student can be a teacher. . . . They do not discharge their teaching function."

† A Series of Essays, by Members of the Churchmen's Union and others, on the Religious Difficulties aroused by the present condition of the world. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Macmillans, 5/- net.

He belongs, apparently, to that large and growing class of educated Englishmen who are neither professedly orthodox in conviction nor yet antagonistic to Christianity, who feel the charm and the appeal of the old tradition and yet are conscious of the force of modern influences. To such an one, finding religion largely in conduct, conscious of no definite standard of faith to which he was committed, holding somewhat vaguely that, though human knowledge was very limited, still there was sufficient ground for believing that God does rule the world, there came in August, 1914, the shock and catastrophe of the Great War. For some good reason, age, health, sex, or other, active service at the Front was impossible, and our imaginary reader had therefore time at home to face the problems which, when the glamour of the war's beginning had faded, slowly but persistently took shape. Possessed of sufficient imagination to realise the tremendous character of the issues, he could only marvel at the inability of some of his countrymen to rise above the standpoint of class or party, and at the zest with which others would discuss Kikuyu or vestments, as though no Empire were at stake. Of what moment were such details, when the world's history and man's faith in God and Right seemed doubtful and uncertain? The loss of personal friends, the impotence of moral and religious influences, the shattering of all confidence in human progress, the abandonment by the enemy of traditional standards and ideals, the outbreak of naked, barbaric force and the possibility of its eventual success, all these combined to bring to a mind alert, thoughtful, intelligent, rather than profound, the mood of complete distrust in any fundamental right or goodness. "The world has had its Christianity, and the world has had its Civilisation, and the Great War is come in spite of them. That is the reality with which we are confronted and, in face of it, there seems no more to be said." In some such mood we can imagine our reader opening the volume with which we are concerned.

He will not find, nor indeed will he expect to find, any conclusive demonstration in these Essays that all is well. For the most part, the writers are justly critical of the facile optimist, and candid in their admission of the possible alternatives to the views for which they plead. Thus again and again, more especially, as is natural, in those papers which deal with the fundamental problems, we come upon statements or qualifications which are in effect a demand upon the reader's faith. Professor Percy Gardner allows that "by the cold and dispassionate intelligence the question whether things are ruled by chance or by God can never be solved" (p. 13); and that "as regards the individual, one hypothesis alone can justify the belief in the providential ordering of existence, the hypothesis of a future life" (p. 23). Also for the Editor, that "there is a Power of absolute goodness which will in the end prevail," is a matter not of argument but of belief (p. 64). For Dr. Rashdall the preponderance of good over evil in our world can only be asserted upon condition that the postulate of Immortality holds (p. 98); and the existence of evil is only explicable, upon theistic grounds, by the admission that evil is the necessary means to an ultimate good, though we are quite unable to say why it should be so necessary (*ib.*) The Dean of St. Paul's gives to our hopes a far wider and grander range than this sorry

present, but we can claim this only "when we have once accepted the belief in eternity" (p. 120). Immortality, Professor Taylor says, is not matter of proof. Neither the "historical" evidence for the resurrection of the Lord, nor the "facts" of the occultist are conclusive, and yet, if we cannot look beyond our present habitation, "the victory in logic rests with the Pessimist" (pp. 125, 131, 142). The whole of his striking Essay is based "on a great assumption"; and in the old phrase we commit ourselves to "a venture of faith" (p. 156).

Such statements or admissions, scattered though they are throughout the book, stand logically as its primary demand. The reader who is not prepared to accept or allow them, as at least a working hypothesis, will find little help for his difficulties in these Essays. And no doubt the particular reader, whose mood we have attempted to portray, may find the demand somewhat exacting. The immediate facts do not make for faith, and it is with the immediate facts that he is *per force* concerned. The conviction upon ultimate subjects, which these Essays seem to postulate, is just the very thing which the tragedy of this Great War has imperilled, and the impulse may come upon him to lay the volume aside with the comment, *credibilia sunt credentibus.*

But further reflection may change his mind. He may remember that in no domain, neither in that of conduct nor of science, can everything be matter of demonstration, and that some truth may lie in the words "nothing worthy proving can be proven." He may feel that there is a prospect of practical wisdom in the book's "middle way" between an easy optimism and the pessimism caused by an immediate and temporary set of conditions, and recognise that, after all, the problems whose stress is so acutely felt to-day are not new problems; they are rather ancient difficulties brought suddenly home to us by a special and momentous crisis in our history (pp. 69, 88). Moreover, he cannot fail to be struck by the candour of the writers. They write in the aid of faith, and they write from certain points of view. But there is no special pleading, no ignoring of the ugly alternative. To some extent the volume is a "Theodicy," but it is singularly free from the defects to which these attemps "to justify the ways of God to man" are so generally liable. Our reader too will notice that the Essays appear under the auspices of a society commonly labelled as "broad" or "liberal," and that six of the ten writers are members of this society. He may be the more inclined to admit the validity of a plea for faith, when it proceeds from a body which has been regarded as somewhat critical, intellectualist, if not rationalistic, in the tone of its thought.

By these and similar considerations one who has been led by the Great War to ponder, in doubt and gloom, over the hard riddle of our world, may come back to this volume for a second reading, prepared to listen to the writers upon their own hypotheses. And he will turn with special interest to the pages in which, as under existing conditions, the three subjects of Providence, Evil, and the Future of the individual Soul are discussed.

It is with Providence, in the individual life, in history, in its universal aspect, that the writers of the first three Essays are concerned. Our reader is invited to abandon, if he ever entertained, the idea that Providence will

save men from the consequences of their own faults and follies (p. 12); and also the idea that the course of this world is so controlled as to be an even, continuous, uninterrupted advance from the evil, towards the good (pp. 20, 59). Much that has been said as to the action of an over-ruling Providence in history is anthropomorphic, and even immorally anthropomorphic, in its tendency (Essay II). Miss Gardner is even inclined to turn away altogether from the historical drama[1] and to find God only by introspection (p. 51), though another writer would still contend that the course of human history moves in the right direction; the contest is "upon the whole in favour of the good" (p. 63). From these limitations and abatements our reader will not dissent, though he may cling with some tenacity to all that can be saved from the second Essay of the idea of Providence in history. He is left with the resultant conception of a divine Power, acting according to natural and spiritual laws, not over-riding human freedom and responsibility, shaping even the details of individual lives for ends and purposes which are not necessarily such as we either desire or recognise ourselves, yet not so victoriously omnipotent as to attain its ends save by slow progress and sometimes after partial defeat. Such a conception of Providence is our reader invited to retain, even while the Great War spreads its desolation and men are asking whether, ultimately, the world is not ruled by successful violence. This is not offered as a speculation or as an entirely proved theory, but rather as a "working faith" (p. 70), in the belief that pessimism is best cured by courage and by action (pp. 19, 22). He is shewn in what sense and with what qualifications it is possible to see the world as it is, and yet retain something of the confidence which the crude yet sincere belief in "Providence" has given to so many simple souls. The way of faith is not so wide or so easy as it was of old. Still, it is an open way; neither science, nor history, nor the fact of evil, nor such disastrous calamities as a modern European war, have as yet irrevocably closed the gate. Entrance and advance depend largely upon a man's own decisions; to the first three Essayists the reader will owe the thanks that are due to those who give assurance that the avalanche has not entirely destroyed the path.

And yet, even as regards the reality and the ways of Providence, there are points which our doubter in quest of faith may still regard as needing further discussion. Take the question of the individual life. Christianity has set great store upon the individual. "The hairs of your head are numbered." Not even a sparrow falls to the ground apart from God. But Nature has a very different way. She has "her darling the strongest," and the rest must take their chance. We are all familiar with the cruelty and apparent recklessness of waste which characterises the struggle for existence. The individual does not seem to count. In the magnificent cosmic progress, so far as we know it, there is beauty, power, purpose, achievement, but no love. To many it seems as though we were witnessing the same thing upon the human plane in this Great War. There is the same struggle for life—"War is a biological necessity," says Bernhardi,[2] though

[1] For the opposite, an extraordinarily optimistic view of the working of Providence in history, see Martineau's *Study of Religion*, vol. ii., pp. 109 sqq.

[2] *Germany and the next War*, Eng. tr., p. 18.

the Dean of St. Paul's dissents (p. 115)—and there will be the same survival of the fittest, the fittest economically, militarily, diplomatically, not necessarily the fittest for the service of the race, when the struggle has been fought out. If the God of history is achieving some purpose by means of war, He seems to care as little for the individual human life in its attainment as Nature does, when she is evolving a new type. It is, no doubt, unphilosophical to pay attention to numbers, but, *ad hominem*, the thing comes home that way. Over against the long tale of lost friends and broken lives we have to set the faith of the New Testament, the possibility that all is still ordered by the working of higher spiritual laws, the unproved prospect of the individual Hereafter. And our reader, without wishing to demand the impossible, may be inclined to wish that Professor Percy Gardner had been able to say more. Between the care of Christianity for the individual and the apparent ruthlessness of cosmic process, the gulf fixed seems so great. Who has not felt it in reading the familiar passage, "Behold the fowls of the air?"

On another point connected with the ways of Providence, it is likely that more positive dissent will be aroused. Nothing has been more common in the recent *Apologiae* for religion than the plea that we know very little, and that, therefore, we must not judge. Preachers have, in effect, been only too ready to found the structure of faith upon the basis of man's ignorance, and have caused no little mental irritation by the demand. Now the Editor of these Essays is quite explicit in assuring us that faith and reason are not to be divorced (p. 65). And yet, when he writes in the third paper of "the profanity of judging God by the light of what seems to us to be the injustice of the present government of the world" (p. 64); of "the madness of judging by the light of our infinitesimal experience of the world-process around us" (p. 71); and of our inability "to form an adequate judgment of the ends and purposes" of human history (*ib.*), there is just a risk that some of his readers may be inclined to protest, "But if I am not to judge by my experience, however infinitesimal, by what else am I to judge at all?" Surely, so far as the *data*, welcome or unwelcome, carry us, we must judge of the world around us, and of the Power at work within and behind it. Such judgment must be largely provisional, always open to modification by new facts, always careful to consider the *data*, material or spiritual in character, as a whole. But it is judgment none the less, nor can there be profanity in any verdict which is candid and sincere. Job and Prometheus were not culpable blasphemers.

Dr. Rashdall discusses the problem of evil. No Essay in the series is more clear in its statement of the question with which it is concerned, or of the answer which it has to give. And the reader who can accept Dr. Rashdall's solution of the difficulty will probably feel that the principal obstacle to belief has been removed. Upon the hypothesis of "thoroughgoing Theism" there are, it is said, three ways of meeting this supreme difficulty of the existence of evil. The first is to deny that evil is really evil. The second, to assert that God is prevented by some obstacle exterior to Himself from carrying out His purpose except by means which are evil. The third, to hold that the causation of evil by a perfectly righteous will is to be accounted for by an internal and original limitation of the divine power.

God, in other words, is limited by His own eternal nature; and just as we do not suppose that God can make two and two to equal five, so we must suppose that there are certain ends which God can only attain through means that are evil, ends which are still so good that, when attained, they will justify the causation and employment of the means. It is this last explanation which Dr. Rashdall prefers.

Let us, with our imaginary reader, apply this explanation to the present issue. We will suppose—what is improbable, but still has been suggested—that the horror of this war leaves so great an impression upon humanity that, after it, the world enters upon a condition of practically permanent peace. By the present evil an immeasurably greater good will then have been gained. As it could be secured in no other way, the causation or permission of the present war was therefore necessary and justifiable. We cannot then blame or criticise the Power that allowed or occasioned it; the higher end in view, only by this means obtainable, outweighs the cost and tragedy involved. This may still be the best of all possible worlds.

There is no better answer to the riddle than that of which this is a particular application. But it involves, as somewhere or other every answer yet propounded does, its element of difficulty. And the difficulty lies here. Is the necessity by which evil must be employed as a means to greater and ulterior good, an *internal* limitation of the Divine Nature? The impossibility of supposing that God could cause two and two to equal five, may rightly be so regarded, for that two and two equal four is part of an order which can be conceived as depending upon the character of the Creator, as an element in the scheme of things accepted or determined by the Divine Will. But it is difficult to believe that God wills the necessity of evil as a means to good, though, given the necessity, it is quite conceivable that He should will the employment of evil as a means. Dr. Rashdall, of course, does not say that God wills the necessity of evil. "Why all this evil should be necessary as the means to an ultimate good on the whole, why God should not be enabled to attain His highest ends *per saltum* . . . these are questions, of course, which we can never answer." (p. 98).

But is not this, in effect, to remove the limitation from within the area (one must use the spacial term) of the Divine Nature and to make it an external condition? Is it not to conceive God as acting within a scheme or order of things logically, if not temporally, prior to His action? And does not our "thorough-going Theism" become then something by no means thorough-going, but so partial that it leaves us, not with a dualistic universe, if that be taken to imply two equal and opposed personal agents as its source, but at least so far from a monistic explanation that we have, on the one hand, the Divine Being, acting under conditions, using such means as His wisdom selects, attaining finally His ends; but also, on the other, an order, exterior to and conditioning the Divine action, necessitating the use of means which a benevolent being would not, save by necessity, employ? There may be no way of escape from such limitation. It was a common belief of the Greeks (see *e.g.*, Plato *Timaeus*, 56, 69) that God was limited by necessity, and we may have no means of advance from a similar position. But at

least it involves so considerable a limitation of the Divine and leaves God's action so externally conditioned, that the spiritual gains of Theism suffer lamentable diminution, and the Divine will can no longer be taken as the ultimate basis of all that is. Something of the kind is recognised elsewhere in this volume (pp. x., 21, 48), and has been frequently urged in other quarters by those who have reflected on the significance of present history. Our supposed reader of *The Faith and the War* may bring himself to accept such limitation, and he will certainly prefer it to the traditional habit of laying all the responsibility for the sufferings of humanity upon human freedom and the doctrine of the Fall. But he will find it hard to adjust his mind to the conception of a conditioned God. He will wonder, perhaps, what consequences and deductions the theory may be shewn to involve, and whether such a Being can be regarded as the all-satisfying object of our faith. The riddle remains; yet he will be grateful to Dr. Rashdall for having led him so far along the road towards its answer, grateful too that the inward kingdom of the spirit and the possibility of action are also left.

The pre-supposition of Immortality runs, as we have said, throughout this collection of Essays as a whole. But it receives special consideration in the Dean of St. Paul's paper on "Hope temporal and eternal," and in Professor Taylor's discussion of "The Belief in Immortality." The Dean, in effect, bids his reader think over again the Pauline thesis, "If in this life only we have hope——." In a sense the Dean is among the optimists. Even from the naturalistic standpoint he claims that a higher significance may be discerned in such human traits as the sense of beauty, the love of duty and of knowledge, and the power of self-sacrifice (p. 107). Moreover, he believes pessimism, even in the midst of the Great War, to be, if excusable, at least quite unnecessary. Movement, on the whole, is in the right direction; democracy makes for peace; the "frightful object-lesson" of our time will not soon be forgotten. Thus "the prospects of continued progress for the human race are very hopeful" (p. 120). And yet, after all, such hopes are temporal and finite. The time-series, whatever its length and elaboration, has its term, and, unless we are prepared to say that "what has been and is no longer is as though it had never been," our very sense of its limitation must raise hope from the temporal to the eternal plane. Hence the Christian attitude: "all things work together for good"; "nothing of absolutely vital importance is at stake in any earthly conflict"; "to a being sure of immortality death does not count."

Personal survival after death has more special consideration in Professor Taylor's paper. He would invite his reader, perplexed by the present evils of the external world, to turn within and to "think nobly of the soul," nor has he any belief in such a secularised Christianity as would make religion another name for social reform. Putting aside, as inconclusive, many other supposed evidences of immortality, the writer brings us "face to face with the real issue. "Does the belief in the supreme value of the spiritual life imply as a consequence the belief in the indestructibility of the individuals who live that life?" (p. 133). Ultimately we believe the Universe to be reasonable. It will not confound us by contradicting itself, in other words it will satisfy the demand of our intellectual nature. On the same grounds

we believe that it will not disappoint our moral nature, that it will not be in final conflict with our need for a moral ideal and a worthy object of worship; thus "the Universe conserves the highest values." But these highest values, it is claimed, involve personality. Only to a very limited extent does a man live on in his work. The future of the race is only a finite one. And unless personality survive, premature death, and the clear absence of justice in the present order, arouse insuperable difficulties. So strongly are these points urged that "pessimistic atheism" seems to Professor Taylor "the only logical alternative to Christian faith" (p. 149). Expressed in a syllogism the position might be thus stated: The Universe conserves the highest values: Some highest values can only be conserved in personality: Therefore the Universe conserves personality.

Now it is, of course, over the minor premiss that our imaginary reader, thinking of friends whom he has lost in the war, will be most inclined to expend reflection. There is the initial difficulty that it is hard to prove a negative, hard to show that the highest values can be conserved in no other way. Further, admitting that the Universe conserves "truth and beauty and goodness" (p. 138), in regard at least to truth and beauty, must we not deem them as in some way so far objective as to exist on their own account, so that every particular truth is an expression of the inherent rationality of the Universe, every transient sunset an effulgence of its inward beauty? Perpetually the particulars come and go; "The One remains, the many change and pass." In these domains, in Platonic language, the idea is permanent and eternal; transience the universal characteristic of its partial manifestations. But the human personality is not, it is said, subject to this condition. So innately individual are our highest qualities, our deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice, our aspirations, our moral ideals, that we and they must perish or survive together; the conservation of the highest goodness carries with it the immortality of the soul. It is an extremely interesting point, alike from the practical and the theoretic standpoints; moreover, if we mistake not, it is exactly the main question at issue between Christianity and Buddhism. Now no man may say by what influences the traditional faith of the Creeds in our personal survival after death may be modified in time to come; nor is it wise to forget that personality is a limitation as well as an asset. And without any surrender of the Christian hope, for which so much has been well and nobly said in this Essay, a reader might still plead that, if the basis of the Universe is indeed spiritual, then the future reabsorption of the individual into the wider divine life which we call God—albeit described by Tennyson as "faith as vague as all unsweet"—is at least faith of a spiritual order, is at least worth remembering as a possible second line of defence, and at least professes to guarantee the conservation of the highest values without those restrictions which personality, as we know it, appears to involve. And such a view, if tenable, is at least far removed from that "pessimistic atheism" which is the only alternative this valuable Essay seems disposed to allow to the Christian faith.

The remaining papers raise fewer problems for speculation. Our reader will follow Mr. Burroughs through his interesting pages on "Faith and Reality," not demurring to his contention that "the higher realities depend

for their apprehension upon faith" (p. 184), nor questioning the wisdom of his appeal to *act*, as if the best things were true. The solution for many of our difficulties, so far as we ever attain one, lies just there.

Mr. Emmet considers "War and the Ethics of the New Testament," pointing out how largely the range of the teaching of Christianity was conditioned by the existence of the Roman Empire—*e.g.*, international relationships hardly fall at all within its vision—and carrying, doubtless, most English Churchmen with him in his conclusion that in this war, on the side of the Allies, "the Christian may play his part with no prickings of conscience."

Canon Glazebrook says frankly, "there is not, and never has been" a nation "which can claim to be Christian in the fullest sense," dealing so, on different and independent lines, with one of the questions raised by M. Loisy in his penetrating little tract, *Guerre et Religion*.

Finally, the Dean of Durham writes on "The Church of England after the War," starting with the admission, which few will be disposed to contest, that "organised Christianity does not come well out of the world's crisis." Still, Christianity is there, and after the war it will be confronted with new demands, moral rather than theological or ecclesiastical in their character. So the Dean comes to the question, can the Church of England "admit the larger conception of Christianity which has been forming in so many minds during these terrible months of war? Can it become the instrument of the spiritual energies and enthusiasms which are present in so many lives?" (p. 248). We can only desire that the Dean's candid and cautious hopefulness may be justified by events. If so, the imaginary reader, whom we have followed through these Essays, will perhaps, once again, find unto himself a spiritual habitation and return, with new faith and purpose, to the ancient and historic Church of his fathers, recalling, as he shares again in her reverent worship, the days when by other hands he was led to it as a little child.

Such, in outline, is this collection of Essays. It is likely that many readers will be grateful to the Editor and his collaborators for their efforts to serve the cause of faith in these times of stress and uncertainty. It remains briefly to make one or two observations of a more general character.

The remark was once made by a metaphysical Scotchman in Anglican orders, that "The English clergy will never discuss the fundamental problems." Possibly the reply might be made that the fundamental problems are just those which admit of no solution, but, at least, we ought to know that they are there. We have not supposed that this volume was, in any sense, specially intended for the clergy, but it is one of its merits, just as it may be on one the compensating consequences of the war, that it leaves the reader with a very definite reminder that, behind all the many issues upon which religious discussion is wont to expend itself, there are always the greater problems which concern the will and the ways of God, the significance of the Universe, the outlook for the individual soul. It is well at times that our minds should move on these high planes; we are better able afterwards to view the lesser issues in their true proportions.

Most aids to faith demand too much. The reader often feels that they leave too many awkward questions without recognition. He who reads this volume will know just what difficulties he must be prepared to face or to hold suspended, if he ventures on the upward way of faith. The cause of religion surely gains by this frank service. Within the area which these writers leave as the domain proper to belief many variations of mood and outlook are possible. Strong conviction may be ours that "all shall be well," or we may "faintly trust the wider hope." But no one who, in these days of battle, has followed these Essayists in their treatment of the problems specially prominent in our time, is likely to be confronted in this generation with new and graver difficulties than those which he has already faced. The adverse elements are allowed: it is much that we may allow them and still believe.

If the book gives us any hint as to the future movement of theology, it lies perhaps in the remark that it "is necessary to recognise that, under the present dispensation at any rate, there is a plurality of spiritual forces" (pp. x. xi.). The old optimism of our prosperous days seems so impossible under present conditions, we are so conscious of the immediate clash of cosmic forces with faiths and ideals which we cannot wholly abandon, that conceivably, no longer finding traditional reconciliations adequate, we may be led to some sort of provisional Dualism, and to the abandonment of the attempt to force all experience into the unity of any single scheme. Facts, on the one hand, and, on the other, Faith, will both be with us. So might we find a renewed interest in the study of Marcion,[1] most important and most religious of all the second century heretics, who boldly said that Christianity and Creation—Nature, as we should say—were irreconcilable. Or we might re-read Huxley's Romanes Lecture, *Evolution and Ethics*, so significant in its teaching that ethical progress has been and must be in opposition to cosmic process, or recall George Tyrrell's statement in his last sad book that "the world is the arena of a conflict between a multitude of irreconcilable ends."[2]

But such a tendency, supposing that it becomes a constant feature of the religious thought of the century, will no doubt affect our Christianity. No longer will this be for us as the key whereby to unlock the inner secrets of the Universe, no longer will religion claim to have its adequate explanation of all the diverse facts. Rather will it be a light in the darkness, a fluctuating, if welcome, element in the strange contrarieties of time. Yet it will still be true that Christianity will be the form in which we have best apprehended a spiritual meaning in the world, and that the more permanent and fundamental elements of its message are the best and highest convictions to which we can attain. For their intrinsic value, in spite of other factors which conflict, it will remain our highest wisdom to live and act on the hypothesis that they are true. That is the victory of faith, and to this venture of choice and action are we invited by writers who have not closed their eyes to the evil and the tragedy of this Great War.

Tendring Rectory. R. B. TOLLINTON.

[1] The mention of Marcion may remind the reader of the Editor's Hulsean Lectures, 1902-3.
[2] *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, p. 120.

A PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS MANUAL.

Again and again we have received enquiries as to a suitable text-book for use in preparing candidates for Confirmation. Our usual reply has been to recommend *The Church Catechism Explained*, by Dr. A. W. Robinson, and to suggest that the teacher should supplement it on the practical side by drawing on his own experience and knowledge. A little book has just been published, *The Goodly Pearl—a Plea for Religion*, by Eleanor T. Webb,* which we should certainly recommend in this connection, especially where the candidates are educated girls or young women who have not been brought up in a definitely religious atmosphere. The book consists of six chapters. The first deals with the meaning of religion, and the others with the safeguards of religion, viz., prayer, Bible study, Sunday observance and Church-going, and the Holy Communion. Whilst deeply religious, the book is thoroughly modern in tone and outlook, and very plain. It is quite suitable as a gift-book, its object being to help and inform young people of good-will who would lead religious lives if only they had the right kind of teaching about religion.

H.D.A.M.

STUDY CIRCLE GUIDES.

Clergymen who regard the Bible Class as on the whole a better agency than the pulpit for modern and systematic Biblical and theological teaching will do well to note the series of Study Circle Guides being issued by the S.P.C.K. So far five of these have appeared.† The most valuable of them seems to us to be *Evolution and the Incarnation*, by the Rev. Felix Asher, B.D. Mr. Asher's guide is most opportune. The Incarnation needs especially to-day to be treated in relation to the theory of evolution. The issues must be squarely faced and the difficulties must be frankly stated even if they be not solved convincingly. On the physical science side and on the theological side Mr. Asher's guide is excellent. On the critico-historical side it is very weak, the author appearing to have no systematic knowledge or appreciation of the bearing of historical criticism upon his subject. Nevertheless his booklet is a great advance on anything of a popular and orthodox kind yet provided for parochial teaching. The anonymous Guide on *The Early Life of Christ* is learned and conscientious; but it loses greatly in value and interest by being in many respects quite out-of-date. This is exemplified by the fact that the Guide recommends as commentaries on the first and third Gospels that of Carr (1879) and Farrar (1880) in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

H.D.A.M.

---

* Published Longmans, Green, & Co., price 1/-.

† *The Times of Christ*, by H. M. Slee and E. J. Grindley, price 2d. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*, price 3d. *The Story of the Eucharistic Liturgy*, by B. T. D. Smith, price 3d. *Evolution and the Incarnation*, by Felix Asher, price 3d. *The Early Life of Christ*, price 3d.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

The Bristol branch has recently lost, by death, two of its most energetic members, the Rev. J. H. Mackie, and Mr. E. T. Morgan.

The Rev. J. H. Mackie, Rector of Filton, passed away on St. Andrew's Day, after a short illness. He was a clergyman beloved by his parishioners and by all with whom he came into contact, and his loss is being keenly felt in the district where he faithfully laboured for thirteen years.

Immediately the Bristol branch was formed, Mr. Mackie became an enthusiastic adherent. He also attended the two Conferences of the Churchmen's Union held at Ripon and Rugby.

During the war Mr. Mackie had spared himself neither time nor labour in various agencies, such as hospital work, and in connection with the Flying School Corps situated in his parish. A life of great usefulness has closed all too soon. Many relatives and friends gathered round the grave-side where his body was laid to rest.

From 1882 to 1902 Mr. Mackie was Assistant Master and Chaplain at Sedbergh School.

Mr. E. T. Morgan acted as Associate Secretary to the local branch. He was a well-known figure in Bristol. For nearly forty years he had been a Tenor Lay Clerk in the Cathedral Choir, and was, consequently, known to many generations of choristers. He was much interested in antiquarian research in connection with the Cathedral, and the history of the city generally. He compiled a short, but useful, history of the Cathedral School.

He was keenly interested in the work of the Churchmen's Union, and never failed to attend all meetings.

The Lending Library of the Churchmen's Union is now in working order for all those who wish to avail themselves of it. We are sending out to all our readers in this number of the *Modern Churchman* an abbreviated list of books and a copy of the Library regulations. All communications in connection with the Library should be made direct to the Librarian, Miss W. A. Coulton, Pentney, Swaftham, Norfolk. Will anyone who is willing to lend any books by Professor Lake, published since the *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, kindly inform the Librarian?

CORRESPONDENCE.

FINANCIAL REFORM IN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

The Financial Reform for which Prebendary Parsons pleads in connection with our Theological Colleges, should not, in some cases, be difficult of attainment. At Wells, Ely, Lichfield, Chichester, Lincoln, and Salisbury, at least all that is required is the appropriation of a couple of canonries to the Theological Colleges. Our chapters were designed, in part at least, for the encouragement of sound learning, and in our smaller Cathedral towns there is no need to consider specially preaching power in the appointment of canons, as in our big town Cathedrals. It is probable that Parliament would lend a sympathetic ear to an arrangement which made the tenure of certain canonries dependent on certain offices in our Theological Colleges, and the money spent in promoting a bill for this purpose, would be well spent. We need, in these days, to learn to adapt our ancient resources to new needs, and to show readiness to do this, would do more to open the purses of business people than many fervent appeals.

Maperton Rectory, ARTHUR N. BAX.
Jan. 4th, 1916.

QUAKERS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SIR, *To the Editor of* The Modern Churchman.

M.H.H. is right, although not, I venture to think, completely right. The early Quakers tried to regulate their conduct, as far as they could, by the letter of the Gospel precepts. To this end they avoided oaths, abstained from the use of titles, tried to give effect to the equality of men in God's sight, and cultivated generally the utmost possible simplicity of speech and behaviour. George Fox would not have dared to disregard a Gospel precept on the ground that a new set of circumstances had rendered obedience difficult or impossible. He and his companions, however, recognized that there were large areas of life for which express guidance would be sought in vain in the Gospels. For these spheres they trusted to the illumination of that indwelling Christ of whom the writer in the *Hibbert Journal* speaks. Their descendants, however, the Quakers of to-day, have recognized as we do, that the Eternal Christ may modify or even supersede the words of the historic Jesus. Thus many of them are prepared to regard even war as a hideous but in some cases inevitable necessity. I need hardly say that I had no intention of speaking disrespectfully of Quakers or blaming them for feeling the pressure of a difficulty by which we are all alike confronted.

JOHN GAMBLE.

MR. ATHELSTAN RILEY AND THE FOUNDATION OF ANGLICANISM.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* Modern Churchman.

At a meeting of the Reading Branch of the English Church Union, held on November 11th, Mr. Athelstan Riley is reported in the *Guardian* of November 18th, to have made the following statement:—

"There are two rival theories of Church authority, and two only, which are either historical or worthy of consideration. The first is that all jurisdiction and all truth flows from the See of Rome. This is known as the Petrine claim, and is the Papal theory. . . . The second is this: That the teaching office and power of government reside in the individual Bishop, acting in general accord with the Episcopate of the Catholic Church as a whole. This is the belief of the Eastern Church, and is known as the Conciliar theory."

Mr. Riley rejects the former theory, and asserts of the latter:—

"By the nature of the case this must be the theory of the Anglican Communion . . . I am quite sure that no other foundation for Anglicanism can be adequate."

Now, I am a priest of the Anglican Communion, and I reject both theories as inadequate, as a rule, for ascertaining truth, which, to my mind, is the only thing that matters. I need not give my reasons for rejecting the Papal theory, as they are probably much the same as Mr. Riley's. So I proceed to give my reasons for rejecting the second.

There is no royal road to learning. A bishop has no means of knowing truth and fact different from those which a priest possesses. His consecration does not give him knowledge which he did not possess as a priest. If he is a scholar in general, or a specialist in some particular department of knowledge, his authority as a teacher rests upon his scholarship, not upon his office as a bishop. A priest or a layman of equal scholarship would have equal authority as a teacher of truth. It is most important to bear in mind the two senses which the term "authority" bears—the authority of superior knowledge, and regulative or official authority. Every bishop possesses a certain regulative or official authority. But only a bishop with superior intellectual powers, who has devoted long years to study and investigation, has the authority of superior knowledge. It may well be my duty to obey the one, and I willingly accept the teaching of the other. If the one orders me to have daily Mattins and Evensong, for example, it is my duty to obey. But if he makes a pronouncement on some point of doctrine, I must ask myself the question: "Does he know more about the subject than I do myself?"

Let us now apply Mr. Riley's theory to practice. My bishop makes a dogmatic statement. I am to ask myself: "Is he acting in general accord with the Episcopate of the Catholic Church as a whole?" Well, to answer this question adequately, would require such a prodigious amount of learning as few possess. And if I possessed it, I should agree with my bishop, not on the ground of his *ipse dixit*, but because my private judgment agreed with his. As a matter of fact, it would be a much easier task to study the question for myself, and to decide upon its truth or falsity on grounds of reason, history, and experience, than to try to find out whether my bishop was "acting in general accord with the Episcopate of the Catholic Church as a whole." Newman expressed himself as willing to accept the dogma of Papal Infallibility if the Vatican Council was unamimous, and if those who opposed the dogma, and ran away from the Council, let the case go by default. But what ground is there for holding that a decision arrived at

under such circumstances must be true and right? Was not Newman, by his own intellectual powers, far more capable of deciding the question of Papal Infallibility for himself than nine-tenths of the bishops who recorded their *placet?* Is there not such a thing as an *Athanasius contra mundum* on the side of truth?

But suppose that my bishop holds Mr. Riley's theory, and assures me that his pronouncement is "in general accord with the Episcopate of the Catholic Church as a whole," can I take his word for it? Must I not ask myself the question, "Is he capable of knowing whether it is so or not?" If I am to take his word for it, then *he* is my authority, not the Episcopate of the Catholic Church as a whole, and I make my bishop my pope.

I do not believe that such a thing exists as the unamious consent of the Episcopate of the Catholic Church. It certainly does not exist where Bishops differ. And even if there were, the bishops of olden times were men of their age, and were subject to the limitations of their age in theological science as well as in other matters, and therefore can be no final authority for us who have centuries of human progress and Christian experience to enlighten us which they had not. They supported their theories by texts of scripture in a way which must draw a smile from every modern Biblical scholar. A great many Bishops have been busy parish priests and men of affairs for the best years of their lives. They may have been excellent and pious rulers of their dioceses; but for this very reason they could have had little expert authority—the only authority that counts with those who only want truth. What time had ever Pope Pius X. for study? He issued the egregious decree *Ne Temere*; but I presume that he simply put his signature to a document drawn up by the Sacred Congregation of the Council—a decree which has shocked the moral sense of the civilized world.

The truth is that no man can have knowledge of anything but what comes to him through his own faculties. Instead of talking about the *right* of private judgment, what we should insist upon is the *necessity* of private judgment. As each man's personal knowledge and experience is very limited, he must supplement it by availing himself of the knowledge and experience of others in matters of which they know more than himself. But even here he cannot escape from the necessity of using his private judgment; for he must test the competence of those whom he would take as his teachers. If a man is sick, he may need the services of a physician or surgeon. But he would be a fool if he made no inquiry as to the competence of the man in whose hands he would place himself confidingly. In the same way, if he had money to invest, it would be a foolish principle to buy shares in a company simply because it promised a big dividend. It is the same with regard to joining or continuing in a religious communion. We cannot escape the responsibility of testing its claims. The man who professes to believe what his Church teaches has already, either consciously or subconsciously, decided that what his Church teaches must be true.

What is the highest claim of the Anglican Communion upon our allegiance? In my opinion it is her love of truth, and the liberty which she allows to her members in the pursuit of it. No doubt she is unduly hampered

by legacies bequeathed to her from past ages, and her machinery for revision is very cumbersome. But this is a fault of every form of human society, and demands patience. But so long as she allows and encourages freedom of thought, and freedom of expression, and freedom of research, we can possess our souls in patience, knowing that sooner or later mistakes will be rectified and truth will triumph.

Mr. Athelstan Riley is himself a standing proof of my thesis. He has no hesitation in accusing Anglican Bishops of unfaithfulness to "Catholic principles." This implies that he personally knows what those principles are, and that they ought to be followed by our bishops. In other words, he does not take his faith from the bishops, but expects the bishops to "toe the line" to his faith. So far I admire him. He is as good a Protestant as myself.

DUDLEY FLETCHER, B.D.

Coolbanagher Rectory, Portarlington, Queen's Co.

CLERGYMEN AS COMBATANTS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

In opposition to the opinion expressed in your editorial of December—"The Clergy as Combatants," and the article on the same subject in the *Modern Churchman* for March, 1915, may I give some arguments in favour of the Episcopal advice? While admitting that it is not wrong for the Clergy to serve as Combatants, I agree with the Bishops that it is not advisable, for the following reasons:—

(1) It is contrary to the Gospel ideal that such bloodthirsty warfare should be going on at all, and although the nature of this conflict makes it necessary for Christian men to shed human blood, they only do so from a sense of repugnant duty.

(2) The mission of the Church is to bear witness to the ideals, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased," and although the Christian soldier is fighting for this ideal, the ideal itself must be maintained by men who are not fighting, *i.e.*, the clergy.

(3) As a Church we must apply spiritual remedies to cure the evils in the world due to sin, and war is one of these evils.

It is the duty of the clergy to minister these remedies—"the means of grace." If the clergy become combatants voluntarily, it will convince men that they have lost faith in their medicines. This would weaken the nation's trust in God, and strengthen the reliance placed upon weapons of war, rather than the arm of the spirit. I believe that if the clergy voluntarily became combatants, the harm done to the spiritual work of the Church would be much greater than the benefit of popularity, and after all, spiritual influence is worth more than popularity.

J. H. S. BAYLEY.

[We are glad to see that our correspondent admits that it is permissible morally for the clergy to serve as combatants, but he holds it to be inexpedient for them to do so.

We have not urged that the clergy as a body should become combatants, but that individual clergymen should be *free* to become combatants if they think that they ought to do so, and that they should *not be*

penalised if they act according to their consciences in this matter. Moreover we believe that the Bishops would even do well to *encourage* all of the younger clergy, where they are physically fit, to join the colours. In certain cases they would be doing far more for the Church at the front than they can do at home, and many of them would come back much more useful clergymen, and thus be the means of increasing the influence of the Church over the nation in the future. Our feeling in the matter is reflected in the following extract from the recently published *Diary of a French Chaplain*, by Abbé Félix Klein. It summarizes a conversation which he had with Mgr. Gibier, Bishop of Versailles, in the early days of the war.

> "The offices of religion, we joyfully declare, will be better looked after in the camps than in the parishes; only the titular chaplains and their assistants will be left; a third of the clergy is under arms. Seminarist soldiers are now priest soldiers; and Rome, like a prudent mother, has withdrawn all the censures aimed at ministers of peace who are forced to give death instead. Who could refuse the Sacrament offered in these terms:—
>
> 'It's getting hot, comrade. If you like I can give you absolution.'
>
> One would think oneself back again in the days of chivalry, the days of the gallant Roland and Archbishop Turpin. What a clergy it will be that returns from the war! Decimated, even then its influence for good will be ten times greater. Even its going has already had its effect.
>
> 'I'm not in too great a hurry to re-organize parochial life,' Mgr. Gibier (Bp. of Versailles) confides to me.
>
> 'All the worse for those who want for Masses on the first Sundays, they will perceive that M. le Curé is gone to the war.'
>
> 'What fine sermons will be those that were not preached!' I am tempted to say." (pp. 34-35).

The fact that one thousand of the Metropolitan clergy have recently signed a petition dealing with this matter, addressed to the Bishop of London, shews that there are many of them who feel at one here with the heroic clergy of France.—Ed. *M.C.*]

A PRAYER FOR TRUTH AND UNITY.

O Lord Jesus Christ, Who hadst many things to say unto Thine Apostles which they could not bear; send, we pray Thee, the Spirit of Truth into our hearts to lead us into all truth. And grant that diversity of thought may not divide those who confess Thy Holy Name, and strive to follow where Thou leadest; but that cheerfully acknowledging their unity in Thee, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, they may learn to love one another.—Amen.